



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2003

No. 2

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, January 9, 2003, at 9:30 a.m.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2003

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 8, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL K. SIMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: God of revelation and eternal guide, when Moses found Your presence and heard Your voice, he began to ask questions. When the disciples of Jesus began their journey, they asked questions of Him and themselves.

At the beginning of this 108th Congress here in the House of Representatives, we pray especially for all the new Members. May they be so welcomed that, with solid reflection and Your grace, they ask the right questions. May the freshness of their presence and the richness of their past experience bring to bear a new understanding of government and the freedom to search for deeper truth. As they learn the workings of Congress, may their questions find attentive listeners and never lead to embarrassment but only to new

perspectives and creative methods to accomplish the work of the people's House.

May this time of adjustment for their families be fruitful and surrounded with joy and peace because of Your presence to them now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. SOLIS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 10 one-minutes per side.

CONGRATULATING JAMES McDONOUGH, FLORIDA DRUG CONTROL DIRECTOR, FOR BEING NAMED A NATIONAL CHAMPION OF YOUTH

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate James McDonough, who is the director of the Florida Office of Drug Control, for being named a national champion of youth by the Youth Crime Watch of America. James has made incredible strides in protecting the dignity and the innocence of our youth in South Florida through several successful drug and alcohol prevention programs. Mr. McDonough's hard work and devotion have profoundly changed the lives of many of our young people. James has worked with Youth Crime Watch of America, which strives to create an environment free from crime and violence so that our children will be able to flourish.

Please join me in thanking James McDonough for his selfless dedication to the care of our community's children.

ON EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I say good morning to our fellow Americans and

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H63

to the public who are watching us as we begin to draw our attention now to something that has been ailing our economy, and that is a discussion of unemployment. It is about time, Members, that we start addressing this issue. When we left this House almost a month ago, we forgot about the 800,000 workers that right after Christmas were given a Christmas gift: they were given no unemployment insurance. Their families are suffering. We are here today now to talk about what we can do to improve upon that.

In the State that I represent, one of the largest, California, we saw well over 1.3 million people out of work. This recession that hit our area began in March of 2001. We need to help all workers, especially families.

This past month, I had the opportunity to visit several of our shelters and food pantries and saw something that was very surprising, children now, small children, 3 and 2 years old and infants, women that just lost their jobs that have no place to go and no food. They are not asking for just a handout. They are asking for jobs. They are asking for also a replenishment of their unemployment insurance. We have a chance now to extend that to 26 weeks.

Let us support the Democratic alternative. I plan to do that today.

CALLING FOR PERMANENT REPEAL OF THE DEATH TAX

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's economy is lagging behind the needed economic recovery that we all seek. Just yesterday President Bush announced a sensible economic growth package that will grow our economy and create jobs for the American people. The President also again called upon Congress to permanently repeal the unfair death tax. As we all know, the 10-year sunset provision on the tax relief bill passed in 2001 has added a level of anxiety and uncertainty into our already complicated Tax Code. The current sunset has made estate planning as unpredictable as our own inevitable fate.

Also, Mr. Speaker, as unemployment levels continue to rise, it is important to note that, according to the Heritage Foundation, just the repeal of the death tax will help to create an additional 145,000 jobs. In turn, the U.S. economy could produce \$11 billion per year in extra output. So not only is the elimination of the death tax fair, it just makes common economic sense.

Mr. Speaker, our President has again asked Congress to do the right thing, and I urge my colleagues to act now to permanently eliminate the death tax.

RECOGNIZING 50 YEARS OF TIRE- LESS WORK FOR WEST VIRGINIA BY SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

(Mr. RAHALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of West Virginia's senior Senator's service to the people of West Virginia in the United States Congress. It was Winston Churchill who perhaps best foresaw the defining nature of the tenure of Senator ROBERT BYRD's tireless work on behalf of the State of West Virginia, our Nation, the House and the Senate and, of course, our Federal Constitution. Churchill said, "Success is not final. Failure is not fatal. It is the courage to continue that counts."

Senator BYRD has seen success. He has never lost an election. But ROBERT C. BYRD does not measure success by personal standards, but by the public good. He does not seek success, only to serve. And through his service, West Virginians have prospered, America has been strengthened, the Congress has been ennobled, and the Constitution secured. Failure has been rare and momentary but always used as a catapult to advance the next charge for the cause of the day.

It is common to celebrate milestones in our Nation's capital, Mr. Speaker; but tenure no matter the length is temporary. What matters, what measures the man, Mr. Speaker, is not the number of terms but the depth of his determination, not the years but the heights of his horizons and not one more sunrise but the courage of his convictions.

By this measure, Mr. Speaker, ROBERT C. BYRD's record can never be outdone.

PRaising PRESIDENT BUSH'S INITIATIVES ON MISSILE DEFENSE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President George W. Bush made history when he announced to the world on December 17, 2002, that America would deploy a national missile defense shield to protect our country. My friend and mentor, the late Congressman Floyd Spence, continually warned us about the urgency of having a missile defense system in place to protect the homeland. President Bush has demonstrated tremendous leadership by taking action to work with our allies to create such a system inspired by Ronald Reagan.

As my colleague and chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), recently stated, "The case for deploying a national missile defense system has never been more clear. Today, the United States cannot stop a single ballistic missile headed for an American city."

I wholeheartedly agree, and I believe Congress should work in a bipartisan fashion to successfully implement a missile defense shield that will protect the American people and our allies.

EXTENDING UNEMPLOYMENT BEN- EFITS SHOULD BE FIRST PRI- ORITY

(Mr. HONDA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, last November, President Bush and the Republican leadership turned their backs on over 1 million Americans. Despite repeated efforts by Democrats, President Bush and the Republican leadership refused to pass legislation that would have prevented unemployment benefits from expiring on December 28. Due to their inaction, over 800,000 Americans faced a holiday season full of uncertainty. I repeat, President Bush and the Republican leadership allowed over 800,000 Americans to lose their unemployment benefits on December 28. Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable. In my district of Santa Clara County alone, over 7,000 unemployed workers were cut off from their benefits, and an additional 13,000 unemployed workers will lose their benefits if Congress does not act now.

Mr. Speaker, 1.5 million Americans have lost their jobs since President Bush took office. Congress cannot continue to callously ignore their needs. I call on the Bush administration and the Republican leadership to make the extension of unemployment benefits the first priority of the 108th Congress.

EMERGENCY AGRICULTURAL DIS- ASTER ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2003

(Mr. BURNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, farmers of the 12th District of Georgia, as well as those across the Nation, are hurting. Disastrous yields and poor crop quality are the result of the weather of 2002. To respond to these needs, to work for Georgia farmers and with the Georgia Farm Bureau and its president, Wayne Dollar, today I will introduce the Emergency Agricultural Disaster Assistance Act. I urge my colleagues to take steps toward aiding some of America's finest in these difficult times by cosponsoring and supporting this bill.

INVITING MEMBERS TO JOIN CAU- CUS ON MISSING AND EX- PLOITED CHILDREN

(Mr. LAMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, we are all too familiar with the names Elizabeth Smart and Danielle Van Dam.

As founder of the Congressional Caucus on Missing and Exploited Children, I invite all of our colleagues to join our caucus and help protect America's children.

During the 105th Congress, a family in the Ninth Congressional District of Texas experienced an unthinkable tragedy. Laura Kate Smither, a 12-year-old, was abducted and brutally murdered. In Laura's name, the Congressional Caucus on Missing and Exploited Children was founded. What Laura's dreadful tragedy has taught us is that we must do more to protect our children.

As a society, our efforts to prevent crimes against children have not kept pace with the increasing vulnerability of our young citizens. Please join this very important caucus, if you have not already, and all of our new Members, please do so quickly. You have a letter coming to you today or tomorrow. Our children, our grandchildren, our nieces and nephews are counting on you to give them a voice in Washington.

□ 1015

TAX RELIEF AND FRIVOLOUS LAWSUIT REFORM

(Mr. GRAVES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge my colleagues to focus on returning more Americans to work. Although our economy continues to grow, I believe we should accelerate the economic recovery to help get more Americans back to work as soon as possible by focusing on two priorities, tax relief designed to get Americans working again and frivolous lawsuit reform. High taxes continue to be a burden on American families. Now is the time to accelerate the tax relief we passed last Congress, provide incentives to businesses to invest in new workers, and provide fair investor tax relief to boost our economic recovery.

We also look for fairness in the legal system. Frivolous lawsuits not only clog our court systems, but they cause higher prices for consumers and threaten robust job creation. As a result, too many businesses, especially small businesses, are investing too much money and paying excessive and frivolous punitive damages and not enough money invested in health care benefits for workers and new job creation. We must protect the rights of individuals who have been wronged, but we should not permit frivolous lawsuits at the expense of the American worker and consumer.

Frivolous lawsuit reform and tax relief are the key to healthy economic recovery and job creation. The sooner we act, the faster we can begin to get Americans back to work.

A NEW VISION FOR THE ECONOMY

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, like many people across eastern Indiana, I was shocked and dismayed yesterday to learn of the complete elimination of over 400 manufacturing jobs from Anderson, Indiana. It is therefore altogether fitting that we would as our first priority in Congress in this majority, Mr. Speaker, pass an extension of unemployment benefits to help Americans like those in Anderson who will be beset by these layoffs. I also applaud the President of the United States, who outlined a jobs package yesterday that I believe is a good start.

But it is written, Mr. Speaker, that without a vision the people perish, and I would paraphrase by saying that without a vision economies perish as well. I would challenge this Congress and leadership in my own party to not just be content, Mr. Speaker, with unemployment insurance extensions, helping those that are laid off, or passing legislation that simply alleviates a recession. We need a new vision for an economy that is abundant and growing at historic levels. We need to bring additional tax relief that will unleash the entrepreneurial energy of the American economy as never before, and part of that must be tax relief designed at encouraging and promoting capital formation.

CLONING BAN

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, recently a religious group called the Raelians announced that they had cloned a human being, and despite all the press coverage they have received most observers are convinced this is a hoax. But true or not, this episode underscores the fact that human cloning is no longer limited to B movie science fiction. The technology exists. It may take hundreds of tries and it may result in dozens of horribly mutated human embryos and the violation of every standard of ethics and decency, but human cloning is very close to happening.

Congress must act before it is too late. We need to pass a comprehensive human cloning ban into law immediately. The House did its job last year, passed a bill that died in the Senate. Now both Houses of Congress need to pass a comprehensive cloning ban. We need to stop this horror before it happens.

The bill is being introduced today by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON). I urge my colleagues to co-sponsor this important bill, and I urge the House to pass it as soon as possible. It is still not too late for us to act.

HONORING JOE FOSS

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow afternoon in Scottsdale, Arizona at 2 o'clock Mountain Standard Time, there will be a memorial service held for the man described as the ace of aces, a genuine hero, Congressional Medal of Honor recipient Joe Foss.

Joe Foss accomplished much in his life. Indeed Tom Brokaw in his book *The Greatest Generation* devoted an entire chapter to the life of Joe Foss. It was a remarkable life, not only in wartime but in winning the peace. A two-term governor of South Dakota, the first commissioner of the American Football League, president of the National Rifle Association, a television personality in his own right, and finally in retirement Joe Foss relocated to Arizona.

It was my privilege to know this great and good man, this genuine American hero who despite the reputation of fliers had none of the swagger but all of the humility and humble nature that a man could possess.

The story goes once a journalist asked Joe Foss about his many earthly accomplishments, and Joe said "Yeah, I guess I have done a lot of things but nothing compares to the day when I met the Lord." Now Joe Foss is with the Lord, and I know the people of Arizona along with the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. JANKLOW), the people of South Dakota, and all of America remember and revere this great American. At ease, Joe, rest in peace.

REMOVING THE TAX ON DIVIDENDS

(Mr. SESSIONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, President Bush this week announced plans to make sure that in the tax proposals that this Congress will address that as part of that tax package we will not tax dividends, and I want to stand up and say how proud I am of what the President is doing because it is furthering the commitment that I believe this House of Representatives should have as well as the President to where we do not tax savings or investment in America.

I believe as the vigorous debate takes place across this country and in this body we will find out that this will be good for people who will be able to save money, save money, and not have it taxed in between that period of time every year for tax purposes but will see their savings grow. I am proud of what this President is doing. I plan to support not only his tax bill but the things the President does, and I offer a hearty congratulations to the President of the United States, George W. Bush.

MERCURY IN VACCINATIONS

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that mercury is a toxic substance. If it is spilled on the ground, they evacuate the area and they bring in the fire department and they clean it up with all kinds of paraphernalia to protect the citizens and the firemen that are working on it, and yet it is injected into our children's bodies in our vaccinations, and in the Homeland Security bill this year they eliminated the possibility of the families who have been damaged and the children who have been damaged by the mercury in these vaccines from having any chance to get restitution from the pharmaceutical companies or from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Fund. That is criminal. It needs to be changed.

We have the fastest growing epidemic in America and the parents have nowhere to go, and it is caused in large part by the mercury in the vaccines. This is just tragic. We need to correct that in the technical corrections bill very, very quickly so these parents have some recourse. They are mortgaging their homes. They are going bankrupt trying to take care of these children. One in 10,000 children used to be autistic. Now it is one in 180. It is an absolute epidemic and this government prohibited the families from finding a way to take care of their children, and these kids are going to grow up. These kids are going to grow up, and they are going to be a burden on society unless we do something about it now.

And in addition Mr. Speaker, I just found out that the vaccines that we are giving to our military personnel who are over in the Persian Gulf who may be going to war with Iraq, they are being vaccinated with vaccines that contain mercury as well.

We need to get mercury out of all vaccines and we need to make absolutely sure that the parents who have damaged children have some course to get restitution this government should not block. It is criminal.

PRESIDENT'S STIMULUS PACKAGE

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say how disappointed I was with the President's so-called economic stimulus package that was announced yesterday. First of all, there is no immediate jumpstart to the economy, and this is just more of the same: Tax breaks essentially to the wealthy, to corporate interests, and very little that means anything for the average American.

Mr. Speaker, we have a tremendous problem with an economic downturn. We have more and more people who have lost their jobs. This is not the time to continue the same failed economic policies. The Democrats have talked about basically giving money

back to consumers in the form of a rebate. We have talked about extending unemployment compensation for at least 26 weeks. In addition to that, our plan is a real economic stimulus. It gets the economy going again and does not basically put together long-term deficits.

If you listen to what the President and the Republicans have been proposing, it is just going to put the economy and the Federal Government into debt even greater, as much as \$2 trillion perhaps over the next 10 years. Why do we continue with the same failed Republican policies? Let us do something that gets people back to work, that creates jobs, that gives some money back to the States because the States have so many problems now with their own deficits. The Federal Government has to do something now that is going to make a difference for the average American, and that is not what we are hearing from the Bush administration. We are just hearing the same thing about giving more tax breaks, eliminating dividends with regard to stocks. These things are not going to do anything in the next year to actually help the American people. In fact, I am very fearful that there is a potential that the economic situation even gets worse unless we get together on a bipartisan basis.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair has a statement about the length of electronic votes.

Clause 4 of rule XX says that Members shall have at least 15 minutes to respond on an ordinary recorded vote or quorum call. But with the cooperation of Members, it is possible to complete a vote in that time.

The Chair believes that closing votes as soon as possible after the guaranteed minimum time should be the regular practice. The Chair is certain that votes can be shortened if Members simply resolve to head to the Chamber as soon as they are notified by the bell and light signal. The Chair will remind Members when two minutes remain on the clock.

The goal of completing votes in as close to the minimum time as possible is even more reasonable in the case of a 5-minute vote because every 5-minute vote necessarily follows another electronic vote and it is always preceded by an announcement from the Chair and a distinctive bell and light signal.

Each occupant of the Chair will have the full support of the Speaker in striving to close each electronic vote at the earliest opportunity. Members should not rely on signals relayed from outside the Chamber to assume that votes will be held open until they arrive in the Chamber.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 23, EXTENSION OF TEM- PORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOY- MENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2002

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 14 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 14

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (S. 23) to provide for a 5-month extension of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 and for a transition period for individuals receiving compensation when the program under such Act ends. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by Representative Thomas of California and Representative Rangel of New York; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The allocations referred to in section 3(a)(4)(B)(i) of House Resolution 5 may be submitted by Representative Nussle of Iowa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate and waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. As we begin the 108th Congress I would like to point out that we intend to continue the courtesy that we began when the Republicans became the majority. This rule allows us to continue in the tradition of extending the minority party an opportunity to offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today allows us to debate and consider a most important measure, S-23, which provides for a 5-month extension of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002. Last Congress we passed the Job Creation and Worker Assistance Act of 2002, which became Public Law 107-147. This economic stimulus bill includes a temporary extension of unemployment compensation and provides for the temporary extended unemployment compensation program.

□ 1030

This program provided up to 13 additional weeks of federally funded benefits for unemployed workers in all States. Benefits were payable to qualified workers through December 28, 2002. Though several attempts were made, and language extending this program was passed by the House, the 107th Congress unfortunately adjourned without having passed an extension.

Today, we have the opportunity to consider legislation that would immediately provide for a 5-month extension of unemployed benefits, through May 2003, with a 3-month phaseout. This also allows for newly eligible workers by the end of May 2003 to receive extended unemployment benefits through August of this year.

Mr. Speaker, 1.9 million new recipients would be aided by this extension, as well as nearly 800,000 continuing recipients who have been affected by the December 28 "cliff." This comes to a total of 2.7 million workers and their families who would benefit from the legislation that will hopefully pass today.

This measure is similar to the language that was championed by Senators CLINTON and NICKLES at the end of the last Congress. Yesterday, the Senate passed this legislation by unanimous consent. Today, the House has the opportunity to pass and to send this measure to President Bush for his signature. By moving expeditiously, we could ensure that unemployed workers do not suffer from a significant delay in the receipt of their checks. I hope that we can mirror the Senate's actions on this bill with a strong, bipartisan vote. I believe that it would be a strong indication of this new Congress's commitment to American workers and their families. Furthermore, extending unemployment benefits and providing unemployed workers with additional purchasing power would be yet another way to help stimulate the economy which, in turn, would help us to keep unemployment down.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentlewoman from New York, I would like to offer a brief explanation of the second part of this resolution. Section 2 of this resolution provides that allocations referred to in section 3(a) of House Resolution 5 may be submitted by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE). This is merely a technical clarification of the rules package we adopted yesterday, which contained a provision to allow the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 302(a) allocations. This is necessary so that the House might complete its obligation to fund this through the current year FY 03 fiscal year.

As everyone knows, the Committee on Rules is currently the only committee up and running, so my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), has technically not been appointed the chairman of the Committee on the Budget yet. This provision merely lets him carry out his duties as if he already were the committee chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for

yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to read a letter from a constituent of mine in Rochester, New York, whom we will call Mary.

"Dear Louise: I am a 52-year-old mother with a handicapped child at home and a daughter in graduate school. I am writing because I am tired of freezing. Our thermostat is set at 55 and the electric company is still sending us threatening letters every month. We pay as much as we can, but without extended unemployment benefits, my son will have to go to an institution. I have 42 job rejections and I have a B.A. in sociology. It's very hard for me to worry about home security issues and terrorism when I am cold. Maybe I can make it through the winter with extended benefits."

Another received over the holidays:

"Dear Louise: My husband was laid off in January. We have taken out two loans against our house in addition to our mortgage to survive and we have a 2-year-old child who is getting almost nothing under the Christmas tree."

There are more where that came from, Mr. Speaker. Another wrote me, "I am 34 years old. A year ago today I was making \$76,000 a year as a software engineer at Xerox, and today I cannot find a job. I have a newborn baby girl, and I am going to run out of my benefits next week. I consistently made \$60,000 a year for the past 5 years and paid taxes accordingly."

None of these people will be helped by this legislation today. None of them.

Mr. Speaker, last month I asked some unemployed workers in my district to sign a petition that calls on Congress to make the extension of Federal unemployment benefits a priority. During the last 2 weeks alone, more than 300 constituents have signed on to the petition. They are losing their homes. They have sold their cars. They cannot support their families, their children; and these are not people who sit back and passively collect checks to avoid working. They have been pounding the pavement in an economy that is shutting them out. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I have been told that it is almost impossible at this time to get even a part-time job or a temporary job in Rochester.

These are people who have worked all of their lives and paid into the unemployment insurance fund and now simply are asking to get some back. Through no fault of their own, they find themselves reeling in an economic slowdown.

While working, they did all of their part; and the cushion that they are given now is resonating like a hard thud. The money is sitting there, Mr. Speaker, in a trust fund that we are failing to fully utilize. That is bad

stewardship. These constituents are not comforted by an abstract proposal to reduce the tax on corporate dividends or other so-called stimulus. A victory for them would be to keep their homes heated and a roof over their heads. To add insult to injury, my constituents were greeted with this headline 3 days after Christmas reading nationwide, "800,000 lose jobless benefits," with the kicker that Congress went home and failed to okay funds.

All during the holidays, Mr. Speaker, we talked about getting back here and the first thing we wanted to do, there was this great sense that we would come back to help the people whose benefits expired on December 28. Unfortunately, that is not the case. If benefits expire later, this bill will do some help, but this is appalling. I have been at a loss to explain to my constituents why a majority in this House let them down. A recent report suggests that without an extension package, a projected 12,000 unemployed workers in Rochester, in the Buffalo-Niagara area are scheduled to lose their benefits between December 28 and March 31. But, as I said before, this measure before us today will be too little and too late for thousands in my region and perhaps in others.

The version we are considering today would only allow for a 13-week extension of benefits for those who are still eligible. It would not address the needs of the nearly 84,000 unemployed in the State of New York alone who have already exhausted their benefits.

Mr. Speaker, it seems almost superfluous to note that the 108th Congress kicks off its legislative program with a rule so closed and restricted that the minority party was prevented from offering even a single substitute. I remember the day that this institution was considered one of the great deliberative bodies, brimming with ideas and a host of viewpoints befitting a democracy, but no more, Mr. Speaker. Today, 205 Members of this body and their constituents have been disenfranchised and shut out. My colleagues, a cold wind is blowing in this institution, and the needs and voices of our most vulnerable constituents are feeling the chill.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic substitute that was blocked by the Committee on Rules last night would have made a real difference to thousands. First and foremost, the measure would reestablish the Federal extended unemployment compensation program and guarantee all jobless workers at least 26 weeks of extended benefits. The program would be extended until June 30, 2003. Workers in every State would be eligible for 26 weeks of extended unemployment benefits after they exhaust their regular unemployment compensation. This provision would provide extended unemployment benefits to merely 2½ million workers over the first half of 2003, and the unemployment rate becomes more and more shocking every day.

Moreover, any workers who exhausted their initial 13 weeks of temporary extended unemployment compensation in 2002 would receive an additional 13 weeks. Any worker who was cut off on December 28 because of the termination of the current program would receive the remainder of their original 13 weeks on a retroactive basis, plus the additional 13 weeks. Finally, any worker who exhausted 26 weeks which they received because their State hit the requisite unemployment trigger would receive an additional 7 weeks if their State remained designated as having high unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that literally broke my heart was when one Member of Congress was quoted as saying, "We don't want to extend these benefits; they will not go out and look for work." We are talking about people who are having a very difficult time; in fact, probably will not be able to find the kind of work commensurate with their education and their skills. I am very much afraid that my district, like many others, will lose them to other parts of the country. It is a tragedy that is happening here today, Mr. Speaker. We could be doing something good for the unemployed of America; but instead, we are turning our back on them and saying, have a little dividend tax relief.

I do want to point out too on the stimulus package, because it is so important that most people who have stock in the United States have either a 401(k) program or a mutual fund, they will not see anything from any kind of tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, last night the Committee on Rules had an opportunity to hold a hearing on this unemployment compensation bill. However, for months our chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), has been involved in the negotiations as a member of the leadership of the House and is a person who has taken a lead on this important issue. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I congratulate him on his fine management on this very important rule.

I will begin by saying that none of us is enthused by the prospect of having to extend unemployment benefits. Why? Because we want to focus on job creation and economic growth; and we know that the people who are out there who, unfortunately, are suffering, want to have opportunity, and that is why we are bound and determined to do everything possible to ensure that they have it. But I see what we are doing here today, Mr. Speaker, as really part of our national security responsibility. We all know that on September 11 of

2001 we had the worst attack and the loss of civilian life in our Nation's history. We know that the aftermath of that has cost us over \$100 billion in direct appropriations. We also know, Mr. Speaker, that it has created a very, very large drain on our Nation's economy, and there are people out there who are hurting.

Last November 14, we passed out of the House of Representatives a bill to make sure that there would be no interruption in unemployment benefits that were provided. Unfortunately, the Senate did not bring that measure up. But they did, however, pass a bill that is identical to this. A bill that is identical to this measure passed the Democratic-controlled United States Senate. This is the measure which was known as the Clinton-Nichols bill. Senator CLINTON from New York who got her start in elective office thanks to my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), who encouraged her from the outset, as the author of this measure that we are going to be voting on today. I believe that this is a measure which will go a long way towards mitigating the pain which has come about because of the aftermath of September 11 and the economic downturn.

So that is why this measure should enjoy broad bipartisan support. As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) pointed out, we do have, in fact, in the rules of the House, since this is the second day of the 108th Congress, I underscore again, we have guaranteed the minority the right to a motion to recommit, so they will have a chance to deal with this issue if they want to in a different way. But I underscore the fact that the measure we are going to be voting on today is a bipartisan measure. It passed unanimously, under unanimous consent in the Senate.

So in light of the fact that it has passed there and we have this measure here, we want to make sure that there is no interruption. One of the reasons that we need to make sure that this is done today is so that there is not an interruption. We want to pass this bill so that we can get it to the President's desk, so that he can sign the bill to ensure that we get this much-needed assistance to those who are hurting.

Now, a number of my colleagues have today gotten up and talked about the President's plan that he unveiled yesterday in Chicago to get the economy moving, and I heard criticism of the opportunity to eliminate double taxation of dividends. We know, Mr. Speaker, that more than half of the American people are members of the investor class.

□ 1045

They have over the past several years been involved in some kind of investment. Guess what? Most of us who are members of the investor class have suffered because of the economic downturn. We all know that.

One of the things we need to do is we need to encourage investment. I be-

lieve that the President's proposal that he unveiled yesterday will go a long way towards doing that. The by-product is that it will create jobs and opportunity out there for people who are hurting today, those people who we are going to be assisting with this plan that we have to extend unemployment benefits.

I yesterday introduced legislation which I believe can help make the President's plan even better. It gets back to an issue that my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), and I have worked on for years. That has to do with the capital gains tax.

A lot of people say, when we talk about a capital gains tax, they laughingly say, who has capital gains? We have had tremendous losses. Why would you think about cutting the capital gains tax?

H.R. 44, which I introduced yesterday, will bring about a halving of the top rate on capital gains from 20 percent to 10 percent, and from 10 percent to 5 percent for those in the 15 percent bracket for those who prospectively invest. We believe that having a 1-year holding period will guarantee that.

While some argue that it creates a loss in revenues to the Federal Treasury, it in fact will not do that. It will create, obviously, that 1-year holding period, so we are going to see revenues increase to the Treasury, but there would be absolutely no cost regardless of how we score it in the first year because of the fact that we would have had that 1-year holding period.

But it encourages people to get into the market, and allows them to have that top rate go from 20 percent down to 10 percent if they get in and realize some kind of capital gains during that period of time. It is during a 2-year window, and I think that is the kind of thing which, once again, can encourage savings, investment, and productivity.

These are the kinds of things we are working on. So while we are unfortunately, unfortunately in a position where we have no choice but to extend unemployment benefits, and we very much want to do that because we know people are suffering, the key thing for us to do as a Congress is to make sure that we create incentives for people to invest and save and produce.

So that is why this is a very fair rule. It is one which I believe will create a good opportunity for us to deal with the challenges that are out there. I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to support it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3¾ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, those of us that come from urban communities know of circumstances when someone is grabbed by the police and they are

interrogated, and they have what is called a "good cop-bad cop" rule. The good cop talks about compassion and sensitivity and why he is our friend, and why he wants to help us; but the bad cop is the one that is mean-spirited, the one that is in the back, and the one that ultimately is going to see that we get hurt.

Our beloved President is the good cop. He is the one that talks about conservatism, but with compassion. He is the one that says that he does not know why the Congress did not take care of the 800,000 people who lost their unemployment compensation after the Christmas holidays.

But, Mr. Speaker, someplace in the House of Representatives lurks the bad cop. He was the one that would not allow us to vote for workmen's compensation before we left here for the Christmas holidays. While the President talks about unemployment compensation and benefits, and while all of us will be voting for the President's package, the bad cop is there saying, yes, but do not give benefits to the 1 million people whose extended benefits have expired, that have worked every day, that have paid into the unemployment compensation, that are looking for jobs.

The bad cop says that we cannot afford to help those million people. Eighty-four thousand New Yorkers who took the hit for 9-11, not for our city, not for our State, but for the United States of America and for the free world, they are looking for work. They are looking to listen to the good cop. They are looking for compassion.

But the bad cop says, no, we will help you later, much later, because we have to cut taxes on dividends. And if you live long enough and survive long enough, you will be able to get a job. Where is the compassion?

But, Mr. Speaker, I am just as hard-nosed as any Republican that is in this House. I know when one wins the majority, he or she wins the votes and does what they want to do. The difference between me and the bad cop is that I thought we had the right to come here and at least debate our position. If Members do not want the substitute that really takes care, in a small part, of a million people who are seeking work, why do they not give us a chance to at least debate it? How does the bad cop just cut off debate, and then they tell us that we have a motion to recommit?

So all we are saying is, can we not lose with dignity? Can we not lose with compassion? Can they not give us a chance, as they have found \$675 billion for the wealthy, to at least let us debate to provide unemployment compensation benefits for a million people? If they will not give us the substitute, could they not waive the point of order for at least the motion to recommit?

No, Mr. Speaker, the bad cop is in charge here, and the compassionate cop remains in the White House.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to work on today is a bill that was passed by the Senate last night. Last year, this House passed a bill very similar to this. We tried to do the very best we could. The process is that two bodies of Congress, the House and Senate, have to get together. That is what is happening today.

Yesterday, the Senate acted, or last night. Immediately last night the Committee on Rules had a meeting. We had a hearing where we talked directly about this bill. Today it is on the floor. I think we are doing the timely things. I think we are doing the right things. I do not think we are delaying this in any manner. It is process, and it is a process that we intend to follow.

I am proud that we had this on the floor today, and I am also proud that by presenting this rule and by having this debate perhaps as early as tonight or tomorrow the President of the United States, George W. Bush, will have the chance to sign this bill. That is what this is about. I am proud that we are able to do that today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the gentleman who is to be chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished friend and colleague for yielding time to me.

I rise in support of S. 23, which will provide a 5-month extension of the Federal emergency unemployment insurance benefits. I do so both as a member of the Committee on the Budget with an interest in the enforcement of the budget resolution deemed in effect for fiscal year 2003, and as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, under whose jurisdiction this legislation has been prepared.

This measure is not inexpensive. The bill carries a \$7.25 billion price tag for fiscal year 2003, and moreover, that price tag fails to take into account an additional \$650 billion in costs that the Congressional Budget Office will recognize for this bill when it adjusts its budget projections at the end of this month.

However, for those among the Nation's unemployed, they will find this to be a lifeline. They will find a lifeline in this legislation that will help them pay their bills, help them pay their family's bills, while they continue to look for work.

As the incoming chairman of the committee charged with enforcing the budget resolution, I must, however, point out that S. 23 will exceed the budget resolution which the House adopted for fiscal year 2003 in March of last year. It would specifically exceed the allocation for the Committee on Ways and Means by \$5.69 billion in budget authority for 2003, and by \$1.9 billion in budget authority during the period 2003-2007.

I, however, like the President and most in Congress, recognize the seriousness of the Nation's continuing

challenge regarding the unemployment rate. We must take into consideration and we must take that action now to ensure economic security for families of those who have been unemployed as a result of the continuing economic trauma our Nation has suffered since the September 11 terrorist attacks.

It is with understandable reluctance that I would ever support bringing a bill to the floor that exceeds the budget resolution, but I believe that it may be warranted during periods of economic instability and insecurity. This is one of them.

As of December 28, 2002, more than 800,000 American workers have had their eligibility for unemployment insurance benefits terminated. Although they have not yet found new jobs, S. 23 will prevent these workers and others who exhaust the benefits prior to May of this year from having their benefits terminated.

In summary, I support this bill despite its cost because of my concern for Iowa workers and American workers who may have a hard time finding jobs during this period of instability and challenging unemployment rate. More important, I commit to drafting a budget again this year which will support and help strengthen the economic recovery and encourage long-term economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of S. 23, and I urge support of this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am fascinated by the comments of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have this new-found compassion for the plight of the unemployed in our country. There is nothing like spending a couple of weeks at home with constituents to open one's eyes.

After months of callously ignoring the unemployed American workers, the Republican majority turned tail and adjourned the 107th Congress without providing any unemployment compensation for people out of work, providing nothing. Now, after almost 800,000 Americans lost their unemployment benefits on December 28, the majority acts like they have seen the light and that they are fully supportive of helping the unemployed.

But while we consider a bill to help these 800,000 Americans, there are 1 million American workers who have already exhausted their benefits who will not be covered by the bill that we are considering today. This is wrong. The selective assistance the majority is attempting to provide does not come soon enough, does not go far enough, and will not help enough. Congress should provide unemployment assistance to every worker who needs it. The bill that we are considering today does not do that.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), on behalf of the minority, offered a substitute in the Committee on Rules last night, but the majority, in the now-traditional House spirit of nonbipartisanship, denied us the opportunity to even consider the substitute. Our substitute would extend unemployment benefits by 26 weeks instead of 13 weeks for people losing their unemployment compensation during the first half of this year, and it would provide an additional 13 weeks to the 1 million jobless Americans who exhausted their benefits last year. There is no question we need to help the unemployed, but we should not be providing selective assistance. Unemployed Americans deserve better than this.

I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, if they do not want to help these people, it is their right to do nothing. They could vote against the Rangel substitute. But they should not deny us the opportunity to try to bring this substitute to the floor and debate our position and have an up-or-down vote. They can vote no if they want to, but we should all have that opportunity to vote up or down.

They give speeches about democracy in all these countries all around the world. We need a little democracy here in the United States House of Representatives. We should not be denied the opportunity to bring this substitute to the floor. This is supposed to be the people's House. The people should work their will. We should not be denied this opportunity. It is outrageous that they are not giving us the opportunity to help these 1 million workers who have exhausted their benefits.

I would urge Members to vote no on this rule as a protest to the fact that we are being denied the right to offer a substitute to help these people.

□ 1100

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, speech after speech we hear about how we have been delayed in this process. I agree. Part of the process is, however, that the two bodies, the House and the Senate, have a process. What we are doing today is taking a Senate bill that is even more generous than the one which the Senate passed last year. We are accepting this because we believe it is the right thing to do.

Our President, George W. Bush, spoke very clearly and very passionately about his belief that when the House of Representatives and the Senate would come back, this was several weeks ago when he spoke, that he was asking us to make sure that we held the necessary meetings and committee mark-ups to make sure that this bill did come to the floor. That is what we are doing today. I am proud of what we are doing. I offer no apologies for what our party stands for.

We are here on the floor of the House of Representatives as a majority party with a great bill. It happens to be a better bill now than what was marked up last year and passed by the United States Senate. But it is one that we agree on, and it is one that we should be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been said here that unfortunately the 107th adjourned without passage of a bill like this. I was here with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) that day of sine die adjournment. We tried to bring up this issue. We were thwarted by the Republican majority. We asked that we bring up the Senate bill. Unanimous consent is all that was needed.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) says the President has spoken passionately. On that day the President was silent. Now there has been political pressure. Now some of the faces of the unemployed have appeared in the newspapers and on television. And so now you are ready to act. The Senate has acted. But, look, I think we can do better and there is time for us to do even better.

One of my colleagues on the Republican side said there should be no interruptions to those who are hurting, if I got the words down correctly. What about the million who have exhausted their extended benefits and who are hurting? To the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), 56,000 from your State. The gentleman from Iowa talked about the unemployed in his State. How about the 8,500-plus who have exhausted their benefits and who are looking for work who are hurting. Why do we not act?

Well, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) talks about the budget process. You are waiving it today up to a point. There is an unwillingness to waive it to let us bring up coverage of those who have exhausted their benefits. There is \$25 billion in the trust fund for this purpose. And our proposal would include enough people so that everybody would be covered within the \$25 billion.

Look, I remember so vividly on that day when we adjourned sine die, we held a press conference, and distributed by the Republicans on the Committee on Ways and Means "Debunking Liberal Myths on the Unemployment Picture." That was distributed as we came out of the press conference. "Debunking liberal Myths on the Unemployment Picture."

Look, I suggest to people who think unemployment is a liberal myth, talk to the unemployed when you go home tomorrow. Talk to their families. Find

out the trials and the tribulations. I think if you will do that, you will agree today we could have done even better. We could have done better.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I have no further speakers. I would like to inquire from the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) as to how many speakers and the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 13¾ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I do have three or four more speakers, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose, and strenuously oppose, this bill. It is fundamentally unfair. We talk in this body about the need for open and fair debate, but the Republicans have shut off the Democrats' ideas on this very important subject, how we can help those people who are unemployed.

Years ago the legendary singer Marvin Gaye had a song out called "What's Going On." Let me talk about what is going on. September 11 and its aftermath are going on, mergers, bankruptcy, failed dot-coms, closed plants, airline restructuring, corporate downsizing. That is what is going on in America. And the bottom line is people are unemployed.

Now, today we could have a debate about two opposing views, the Democrats and the Republicans. Let us talk about what Democrats would do versus the Republicans' approach to Americans who are unemployed.

First, those people we call exhaustees, those who have exhausted their benefits. There are 1 million Americans who have exhausted their benefits. The Democrats would give them 13 weeks of additional benefits. The Republican plan before us today gives them zero. That is unfair.

Let us talk about what we call new entries, that is, the 93,000 people each week who become unemployed, exhaust all of their benefits at the State level. The Democrats would give them 26 weeks, roughly 6½ months. The Republicans would only give them 3½ months, 13 weeks. The Democrat plan is clearly fair. And critically the people who have been cut off, 800,000 workers were cut off on December 28. The Democrats would give them a total of 26 weeks. The Republicans say, well, whatever is left, that is what you get. If you only have 2 weeks of benefits left, you only get 2 weeks of unemployment benefits. That is not fair.

Now the Republicans say we do not want to talk about unemployment. We want to talk about growth and that is why we are proposing to give a big tax

break to the wealthy in the form of eliminating the tax on dividends and that will spur growth in jobs. Sounds good, does it not?

The problem is that conservative compassion or compassionate conservatism is out of sync because their job creation comes sometimes years after these people are unemployed. They need benefits and help now. Then if the jobs come, fine. But we ought to be helping Americans now and the Republicans do not do it. That is tragedy. I will vote down this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me time.

The President is intent on going to war. He continues to take us down a path to war. The papers carry today the story that the stimulus package is going to be eaten up by the war. You can pour that \$700 billion into the economy, and it will not do any good because nobody is going to invest, which means we are going to continue to have long-term unemployment.

My State has the highest rate of unemployment. The distinguished gentleman from California says, well, they are going to get some money from the stimulus package when they get their capital gains excuse there.

I am going to tell the 30,000 people in my State that are not covered by this bill that we will try to get an address where they can go and get their money for their non-existent tax benefits.

This is a travesty, and what you are doing is you are putting a little Band-Aid on it today because you have got public pressure. You will be back. I guarantee you will be back in March. You will be out here saying, well, amazingly, the economy has not picked up. We do not know what to do, so we have to give a few more benefits, a few more nickels and dimes out the door.

If you continue down this path to war and spend the money out of the Treasury of the United States in a stupid tax giveaway to the wealthy, 70 percent of the people in this country will not get more than a \$100 out of it. If you think that is a stimulus to the economy, you do not understand ordinary people.

So you are wasting \$700 billion. You are taking us into a senseless war, and you will not take care of people who are sitting in your own districts. And you will not let us debate it. You say, well, we have the budget, we have the budget, you know, we have to keep the budget in balance. You gave that up and you are going to give it up.

The President says we are having a wartime budget. So in a wartime budget you do not have to worry about what is going on. You can just spend money on all kinds of things but not on the unemployed, even though the \$25 billion is sitting right in the account right now, and they will not acquire a damn dime.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members that remarks in debate should avoid profanity.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we live in a cold world, and we are in a cold and somewhat impassioned Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a world that does not seem to care that people who deserve or get unemployment insurance are, in fact, the workers of America who have built this Nation. Now we have a bill given by now the singular government of the United States, Republican Presidency, Republican Senate, Republican House. There is no two-party system in this Nation, which means that the railroad train, the train of no return, will be the legislative call of the day.

How in the world can you argue that we live in a democracy when you are denying the opposition the right to present their proposal that will, in fact, save families and save lives?

The Democrats realize that people are unemployed because there is no work. And the Bill Clinton administration, in the first term he created 11 million jobs in America. Right now the Bush administration has seen 2 million jobs go down the drain. So are you telling me that the 56,000 people in the State of Texas are ne're-do-wells who do not want to work? No.

They have fallen upon hard times. They are trying to work. Their mortgage payments are coming. The college tuition payments are coming. The car payments are coming. And we are leaving them to fall on their spears.

We have got a war that we do not need that is costing us a trillion dollars, but yet a lousy \$7.2 billion is all we are going to give. We cannot afford to give 26 full weeks and pay for the million people that are about to lose their homes right now because they are not included in this bill that we have to vote for. I never knew or thought as a child growing up in America that had unemployed parents, saw the hardship of trying to make ends meet, borrowing from relatives to stay alive, that we would have a government that would be so uncaring, that we would stand here and force down this legislative initiative because we do not like the opposition, because we are in control now.

The only thing I can say is that this is an abomination and Lord have mercy on all of us as we try to be compassionate for those who are in need.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat painful to say that we begin the 108th Congress today with new Members, a new majority in the Senate under Republican control, a Republican-controlled House, a Republican in the White House, and the first order of legislative business in the 108th Congress in the year 2003 is a plan which gags the minority party in the greatest democracy in the world to discuss something very important to millions of Americans who are working and about to lose their jobs or who are trying to work but cannot find a job. It is difficult to believe that today, January 8 of 2003, that in the House of Representatives, the people's House, we will not have an opportunity to discuss how we can provide unemployment benefits, emergency unemployment benefits to a million Americans who are struggling to find work.

In my State of California, over 100,000 Americans are out of a job and are trying to find ways to put food on the table. But in this House of Representatives, I cannot put a proposal before my colleagues for a vote, whether it wins or loses, up or down, to decide whether or not those 1 million Americans, and more than 100,000 of them in my State of California, cannot see unemployment benefits extended for them as this proposal would do for some other Americans.

□ 1115

Why Peter gets it and Paul does not, I do not understand, but that is the case, and when we look at the sad history of this, we see that a year ago, less than a year ago, a few months ago, Democrats put a proposal to do exactly what is on the table now, to extend benefits.

At the end of last year, when we knew that people were losing work, when we knew that on December 28, close to a million people would run out of benefits and that we knew more than 80,000 people a week were becoming unemployed and without unemployment benefits, this Congress did try to do something, at least the Democratic side of the Congress.

We had a proposal under the leadership of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) to provide those extended benefits, but we could not get it heard in this House for the same reason we cannot have the proposal heard today. We were gagged. It was bad then but it is shameful today that we begin a new session on what should be a bipartisan note for Americans who are looking for work, and we cannot do it.

Yet just yesterday the President proposed close to \$700 billion worth of tax cuts to help mostly wealthy investors, not folks who are out there working with their hands, but folks who invested money and can make money because the company happens to earn a little bit more on their stock. The folks who are willing to use their legs,

their hands, their minds, who are right now out of work, will not get any assistance, not just one American, not just 1,000 Americans, but about a million Americans.

I am going to go back to California. If we pass something I will be able to tell some of my Californians and colleagues there we got them that extended benefit that they needed to put food on the table, but I am going, in the same moment, to turn over to the next American in California and say, sorry, I could not even take a vote to see if I could extend their benefits. That is not the note we should start on, but that is the note that this Congress and the House of Representatives starts on.

I believe we have an opportunity today to change that. We should not for us, not for politicians but for hard-working Americans who probably will not even listen to this debate, but this is still their House, this is the people's House, and we should do the people's work, and to leave today or tomorrow or this week, as we did back in December, without concluding the work for our working Americans who are seeking jobs is unfair, too little too late. Let us do something right. Let us do it for all Americans, not just for some.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Today, we have had a fabulous debate, an opportunity to have people from both parties, both sides of the aisle to be able to talk about this bill that is before us, S. 23. It is a Senate bill. It is an agreement that was reached in the other body just last night.

Last night, this body, through the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) had the Committee on Rules come into order. We had a hearing last night. We talked about this important issue. We deliberated. We heard from both sides. We followed the process. That process that the Committee on Rules went through is one that this body has gone through for many years, and we came up with a product.

The product that we chose was exactly the same bill that the Senate had approved last year but made better, and was done all last night.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Texas to yield for a unanimous consent.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it is my time and I do not choose to yield at this time. I am offering to close as is provided for by the rules, and I will allow the gentlewoman to insert something into the RECORD if that is a request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Does the gentlewoman have a request?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I meant to say at the end of my time that we will call for a vote on the previous question. If it is defeated, we

have an amendment to the rule, that we would like to offer the Rangel substitute for 26 weeks of extended benefits. We are concerned that we were denied an opportunity to put that on the floor, and by voting no on the previous question we will be able to substitute.

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 14 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (S. 23) to provide for a 5-month extension of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 and for a transition period for individuals receiving compensation when the program under such Act ends. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by Representative Thomas of California and Representative Rangel of New York; (2) the amendment specified in section 2, if offered by Representative Rangel of New York or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Sec. 2. The amendment referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows:

H.R.—

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2003".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Extension of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002.

Sec. 3. Entitlement to additional weeks of temporary extended unemployment compensation.

Sec. 4. Application of revised rate of insured unemployment.

Sec. 5. Additional TEUC extended benefit period trigger.

Sec. 6. Additional weeks of benefits for workers in high unemployment States.

Sec. 7. Effective date.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2002.

(a) SIX-MONTH EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—Section 208 of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 30) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 208. APPLICABILITY.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), an agreement entered into under this title shall apply to weeks of unemployment—

"(1) beginning after the date on which such agreement is entered into; and

"(2) ending before July 1, 2003.

"(b) TRANSITION.—In the case of an individual who is receiving temporary extended unemployment compensation for the week which immediately precedes July 1, 2003, temporary extended unemployment compensation shall continue to be payable to

such individual for any week thereafter from the account from which such individual received compensation for the week immediately preceding that termination date. No compensation shall be payable by reason of the preceding sentence for any week beginning after December 31, 2003."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21).

SEC. 3. ENTITLEMENT TO ADDITIONAL WEEKS OF TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

Paragraph (1) of section 203(b) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount established in an account under subsection (a) shall be equal to 26 times the individual's weekly benefit amount for the benefit year."

SEC. 4. APPLICATION OF REVISED RATE OF INSURED UNEMPLOYMENT.

Section 207 of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended—

(1) by striking "In" and inserting "(a) GENERAL DEFINITIONS.—In"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(b) ADJUSTED INSURED UNEMPLOYMENT RATE.—For purposes of carrying out section 203(c) with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2003, the term 'rate of insured unemployment', as used in section 203(d) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note), has the meaning given such term under section 203(e)(1) of such Act, except that individuals exhausting their right to regular compensation during the most recent 3 calendar months for which data are available before the close of the period for which such rate is being determined shall be taken into account as if they were individuals filing claims for regular compensation for each week during the period for which such rate is being determined."

SEC. 5. ADDITIONAL TEUC EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD TRIGGER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 203(c) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) ADDITIONAL EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD TRIGGER.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective with respect to compensation for weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2003, an agreement under this title shall provide that, in addition to any other extended benefit period trigger, for purposes of beginning or ending any extended benefit period under this section—

"(i) there is a State 'on' indicator for a week if—

"(I) the average rate of total unemployment in such State (seasonally adjusted) for the period consisting of the most recent 3 months for which data for all States are published before the close of such week equals or exceeds 6 percent; and

"(II) the average rate of total unemployment in such State (seasonally adjusted) for the 3-month period referred to in clause (i) equals or exceeds 110 percent of such average rate for either (or both) of the corresponding 3-month periods ending in the 2 preceding calendar years; and

"(ii) there is a State 'off' indicator for a week if either the requirements of subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i) are not satisfied.

“(B) NO EFFECT ON OTHER DETERMINATIONS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of any agreement described in subparagraph (A), any week for which there would otherwise be a State ‘on’ indicator shall continue to be such a week and shall not be determined to be a week for which there is a State ‘off’ indicator.

“(C) DETERMINATIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY.—For purposes of this subsection, determinations of the rate of total unemployment in any State for any period (and of any seasonal adjustment) shall be made by the Secretary.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 203(c)(1) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended by inserting “or (3)” after “paragraph (2)”.

SEC. 6. ADDITIONAL WEEKS OF BENEFITS FOR WORKERS IN HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT STATES.

Section 203(c)(1) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 30) is amended by striking “an amount equal to the amount originally established in such account (as determined under subsection (b)(1))” and inserting “7 times the individual’s weekly benefit amount for the benefit year”.

SEC. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) RESUMPTION OF BENEFITS.—

(1) RULE APPLICABLE TO EXHAUSTEES.—In the case of any individual—

(A) to whom any temporary extended unemployment compensation was payable for any week beginning before January 1, 2003, and

(B) who exhausted such individual’s rights to such compensation (by reason of the payment of all amounts in such individual’s temporary extended unemployment compensation account) before January 1, 2003, such individual’s eligibility for any additional weeks of temporary extended unemployment compensation by reason of the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) RULE APPLICABLE TO NON-EXHAUSTEES.—In the case of any individual—

(A) to whom any temporary extended unemployment compensation was payable for any week beginning before January 1, 2003, and

(B) as to whom the condition described in paragraph (1)(B) does not apply, such individual shall, upon appropriate application, be eligible for temporary extended unemployment compensation (in accordance with the provisions of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, as amended by this Act) with respect to any weeks of unemployment beginning on or after December 29, 2002.

(c) DATE FOR DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY OF EXHAUSTEES FOR AUGMENTED BENEFITS.—In the case of any individual described in subsection (b)(1), the determination under section 203(c) as to whether such individual’s State is in an extended benefit period (for purposes of determining eligibility for augmented benefits under the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, as amended by this Act) shall be made—

(1) as of the date of enactment of this Act, and

(2) without regard to whether or not such a determination was made under the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation

Act of 2002, as in effect before the amendments made by this Act.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yielded to the gentlewoman for the purpose of allowing something to be placed into the RECORD. It is my time and I wish to gain that time back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman may insert her comments into the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker for allowing the gentlewoman to insert that into the RECORD.

So now we are at the point where we have completed part of the process where we are going to vote on the rule, and in a few minutes, I assume after a vote on that, then we will have a debate where we will talk about the substance further of the bill. This has allowed both parties the time to place forward their ideas, and for anyone to think that we have not allowed free time or gagged someone to tell them what they can or cannot discuss is simply ludicrous. That is why we allow the time on the floor.

I am proud of what the Committee on Rules has done. I am proud of the debate that we have had today, and I look forward to the President of the United States having an opportunity, perhaps as early as this afternoon or tomorrow, to sign this bill to get these benefits to the people that need it the most. I am proud of what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the underlying legislation which is so critical.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this closed rule and to speak about the need for extending unemployment benefits. I’m happy to see that our Republican colleagues have finally gotten around to agreeing with us that the working people of this country need help in the economic downturn that is plaguing our country. Democrats tried to pass emergency extensions for unemployed workers across the country during our November session, but the Republican leadership only wanted to extend benefits for unemployed workers in Alaska, Oregon, and Washington.

What did this legislative delay mean for my 9th California district? It meant that three days after Christmas almost 7,500 in the Oakland metropolitan area lost their federal extended unemployment benefits. It meant that these people, who are already struggling in an environment of high housing costs, are struggling to survive. It meant that in an economy that is already miserable we had fewer spending consumers.

I applaud the fact that the Republicans have agreed to extend unemployment benefits, and I will vote for this legislation. But I also want to insist that we do more. For those people who have exhausted their benefits, for instance, the President’s plan provides no more help. On the other hand, the Democratic legislation would provide 13 weeks more of benefits for those who have already exhausted their extended federal benefits, perhaps the people with the greatest need.

President Bush’s so-called economic stimulus package spends billions to fatten the wal-

lets of the wealthy, but our plan focuses aid on lower- and middle-class workers who need that help immediately.

That’s why I urge a “no” vote on this closed rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before placing the question, the Chair has a statement about the length of electronic votes.

Clause 4 of rule XX says that Members shall have at least 15 minutes to respond on an ordinary record vote or quorum call, but with cooperation among Members, it is possible to complete a vote in that time.

The Chair believes that closing votes as soon as possible after the guaranteed minimum time should be the regular practice. The Chair is certain that votes can be shortened if Members simply resolve to head to the chamber as soon as they are notified by the bell and light signal. The Chair will remind Members when 2 minutes remain on the clock.

The goal of completing votes in as close to the minimum time as possible is even more reasonable in the case of 5-minute votes because every 5-minute vote necessarily follows another electronic vote and is always preceded by an announcement from the Chair and a distinctive bell and light signal.

No occupant of the chair would prevent a Member who is in the well of the Chamber before a result is announced from casting his or her vote, but each occupant of the chair will have the full support of the Speaker in striving to close each electronic vote at the earliest opportunity. Members should not rely on signals relayed from outside the Chamber to assume that votes will be held open until they arrive in the Chamber.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for an electronic vote, if ordered, on the question of adopting the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 196, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—224

Aderholt
Akin

Bachus
Baker

Ballenger
Barrett (SC)

Bartlett (MD) Gillmor
Barton (TX) Gingrey
Bass Goode
Beauprez Goodlatte
Bereuter Goss
Biggert Granger
Bilirakis Graves
Bishop (UT) Green (WI)
Blackburn Greenwood
Blunt Gutknecht
Boehlert Harris
Boehner Hart
Bonilla Hastings (WA)
Bonner Hayes
Bono Hayworth
Boozman Hefley
Bradley (NH) Hensarling
Brady (TX) Herger
Brown (SC) Hobson
Brown-Waite, Hoekstra
Ginny Hostettler
Burgess Houghton
Burns Hulshof
Burr Hunter
Burton (IN) Hyde
Buyer Isakson
Calvert Issa
Camp Istook
Cannon Janklow
Cantor Jenkins
Capito Johnson (CT)
Carter Johnson (IL)
Castle Johnson, Sam
Chabot Jones (NC)
Chocola Keller
Coble Kelly
Cole Kennedy (MN)
Collins King (IA)
Combest King (NY)
Cox Kingston
Crane Kirk
Crenshaw Kline
Cubin Knollenberg
Culberson Kolbe
Cunningham LaHood
Davis, Jo Ann Latham
Davis, Tom LaTourette
Deal (GA) Leach
DeLay Lewis (CA)
DeMint Lewis (KY)
Diaz-Balart, L. Linder
Doolittle LoBiondo
Dreier Lucas (OK)
Duncan Manzullo
Dunn McCotter
Ehlers McCrery
Emerson McHugh
English McInnis
Everett McKeon
Feeney Mica
Ferguson Miller (FL)
Flake Miller (MI)
Fletcher Miller, Gary
Foley Moran (KS)
Forbes Murphy
Fossella Musgrave
Franks (AZ) Ney
Frelinghuysen Northup
Gallegly Norwood
Garrett (NJ) Nunes
Gerlach Nussle
Gibbons Osborne
Gilchrest Ose

NAYS—196

Abercrombie Ballance
Ackerman Boswell
Alexander Boucher
Allen Berkley
Andrews Berman
Baca Berry
Baird Bishop (GA)
Baldwin Bishop (NY)

Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Soudier
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancred
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Capuano
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Clay
Clyburn
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)

Cardin
Conyers
Delahunt
Diaz-Balart, M.
Kilpatrick

Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (NC)
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell

NOT VOTING—13

Kind
Majette
Miller, George
Myrick
Nethercutt

Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

So the previous question was ordered.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

As stated for:
Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 5
I was unavoidably detained. Had I been
present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr.
Speaker, on rollcall No. 5 I was inadvertently
detained. Had I been present, I would have
voted "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on
the table.

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AU- THORITY TO HOUSE COMMIT- TEES

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant
to House Resolutions 5 and 14, I am
submitting for printing in the CON-
GRESSIONAL RECORD the committees'
spending allocations contemplated by
section 302(a) of the Congressional
Budget Act.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 8, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives, Office
of the Speaker, U.S. Capitol, Washington,
DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Section 2 of House
Resolution 14 provides that I may submit the
302(a) allocations contemplated by House
Concurrent Resolution 353 of the One Hun-
dred Seventh Congress, as adopted by the
House.

The attached tables, which I submit for
printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pro-
vide that information.

Sincerely,

JIM NUSSLE.

Attachments.

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES¹—APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

(In millions of dollars)

		2003
General Purpose *	BA	747,174
	OT	748,528
Highways *	BA	
	OT	28,761
Mass Transit *	BA	
	OT	6,030
Conservation *	BA	1,922
	OT	1,872
Total Discretionary Action	BA	749,096
	OT	785,191
	BA	350,316
Current Law Mandatory	OT	353,319

* Shown for display purposes only.
¹ Reflecting allocation adjustments through the end of the 107th Con-
gress.

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES¹—COMMITTEES OTHER THAN APPROPRIATIONS

(By fiscal year in millions of dollars)

		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Total 200–2007	203–2012
Agriculture Committee:								
Current Law Base	BA	36,573	35,545	34,841	34,241	34,889	176,089	n.a.
	OT	33,247	33,726	32,788	32,283	32,885	164,929	n.a.
Discretionary Action	BA	7,825	7,604	7,198	7,249	7,141	37,017	n.a.
	OT	7,271	7,019	6,688	6,727	6,774	34,479	n.a.
Total	BA	44,398	43,149	42,039	41,490	42,030	213,106	n.a.
	OT	40,518	40,745	39,746	39,010	39,659	199,408	n.a.
Armed Services Committee:								
Current Law Base	BA	76,090	78,358	80,609	83,134	85,779	403,970	n.a.
	OT	75,258	77,722	80,228	82,780	85,466	401,454	n.a.

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES¹—COMMITTEES OTHER THAN APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

[By fiscal year in millions of dollars]

			2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Total	
								200–2007	203–2012
Discretionary Action	BA	516	652	1,025	1,605	2,006	5,804	n.a.	
	OT	516	652	1,025	1,605	2,006	5,804	n.a.	
Total	BA	76,606	79,010	81,634	84,739	87,785	409,774	n.a.	
	OT	75,774	78,374	81,253	84,385	87,472	407,258	n.a.	
Committee on Education and the Workforce:									
Current Law Base	BA	4,633	4,325	4,709	4,885	5,066	23,618	n.a.	
	OT	3,264	3,172	3,475	3,604	3,744	17,259	n.a.	
Energy and Commerce Committee:									
Current Law Base	BA	10,248	10,017	11,164	11,498	12,503	55,430	n.a.	
	OT	11,401	11,496	11,562	11,871	11,881	58,211	n.a.	
Discretionary Action	BA	95	285	606	801	922	2,709	n.a.	
	OT	59	272	598	798	922	2,649	n.a.	
Total	BA	10,343	10,302	11,770	12,299	13,425	58,139	n.a.	
	OT	11,460	11,768	12,160	12,669	12,803	60,860	n.a.	
Financial Services Committee:									
Current Law Base	BA	7,985	8,428	8,249	8,053	8,574	41,289	n.a.	
	OT	2,696	1,578	541	–165	–344	4,306	n.a.	
Government Reform Committee:									
Current Law Base	BA	66,536	69,943	73,568	76,706	79,236	365,989	n.a.	
	OT	65,527	68,971	72,573	75,514	78,253	361,038	n.a.	
Committee on House Administration:									
Current Law Base	BA	82	85	85	82	81	415	n.a.	
	OT	37	161	18	14	14	244	n.a.	
International Relations Committee:									
Current Law Base	BA	10,069	10,390	10,705	10,952	11,287	53,403	n.a.	
	OT	10,075	10,127	10,364	10,591	10,864	52,021	n.a.	
Judiciary Committee:									
Current Law Base	BA	6,404	5,133	5,116	5,092	5,112	26,857	n.a.	
	OT	5,763	5,613	5,281	5,148	5,180	26,985	n.a.	
Resources Committee:									
Current Law Base	BA	2,537	2,430	2,371	2,394	2,392	12,124	n.a.	
	OT	2,471	2,313	2,052	2,297	2,154	11,287	n.a.	
Discretionary Action	BA	0	113	498	89	0	700	n.a.	
	OT	0	113	498	89	0	700	n.a.	
Total	BA	2,537	2,543	2,869	2,483	2,392	12,824	n.a.	
	OT	2,471	2,426	2,550	2,386	2,154	11,987	n.a.	
Science Committee:									
Current Law Base	BA	143	20	17	17	18	215	n.a.	
	OT	147	102	56	29	24	358	n.a.	
Small Business Committee:									
Current Law Base	BA	3	2	1	1	1	8	n.a.	
	OT	–238	–88	–32	–30	–28	–416	n.a.	
Transportation and Infrastructure Committee:									
Current Law Base	BA	54,029	51,640	50,234	50,657	50,932	257,492	n.a.	
	OT	14,910	12,014	10,429	10,651	10,774	58,778	n.a.	
Discretionary Action	BA	0	4,369	4,369	4,369	4,369	17,476	n.a.	
	OT	0	0	0	0	0	0	n.a.	
Total	BA	54,029	56,009	54,603	55,026	55,301	274,968	n.a.	
	OT	14,910	12,014	10,429	10,651	10,774	58,778	n.a.	
Veterans' Affairs Committee:									
Current Law Base	BA	1,629	2,055	2,543	3,082	3,633	12,942	n.a.	
	OT	1,570	1,999	2,590	3,065	3,431	12,655	n.a.	
Ways and Means Committee:									
Current Law Base	BA	643,804	661,849	684,591	701,838	727,703	3,419,785	n.a.	
	OT	645,017	661,964	684,461	701,118	727,005	3,419,565	n.a.	
Discretionary Action	BA	2,203	858	1,280	1,639	1,875	7,855	n.a.	
	OT	174	853	1,231	1,660	1,943	5,861	n.a.	
Total	BA	646,007	662,707	685,871	703,477	729,578	3,427,640	n.a.	
	OT	645,191	662,817	685,692	702,778	728,948	3,425,426	n.a.	
Current Law Base, Medicare	BA	174,977	180,768	193,068	197,062	211,086	n.a.	2,224,058	
	OT	174,843	181,045	192,994	196,851	211,379	n.a.	2,223,844	
Discretionary Action	BA	4,650	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	347,270	
	OT	4,575	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	347,270	
Total	BA	174,977	180,768	193,068	197,062	211,086	n.a.	2,224,058	
	OT	174,843	181,045	192,994	196,851	211,379	n.a.	2,223,844	

n.a.=not applicable.

¹ Reflecting allocation adjustments through the end of the 107th Congress.

□ 1145

EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2002

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 14, I call up the Senate bill (S. 23) to provide for a 5-month extension of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 and for a transition period for individuals receiving compensation when the program under such Act ends, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 14, the Senate bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of S. 23 is as follows:

S. 23

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF THE TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2002.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 208 of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–147; 116 Stat. 30) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 208. APPLICABILITY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), an agreement entered into under this title shall apply to weeks of unemployment—

“(1) beginning after the date on which such agreement is entered into; and

“(2) ending before June 1, 2003.

“(b) TRANSITION FOR AMOUNT REMAINING IN ACCOUNT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), in the case of an individual who has amounts remaining in an account established under section 203 as of May 31, 2003, temporary extended unemployment compensation shall continue to be payable to such individual from such amounts for any week beginning after such date for which the individual meets the eligibility requirements of this title.

“(2) NO AUGMENTATION AFTER MAY 31, 2003.—If the account of an individual is exhausted

after May 31, 2003, then section 203(c) shall not apply and such account shall not be augmented under such section, regardless of whether such individual's State is in an extended benefit period (as determined under paragraph (2) of such section).

“(3) LIMITATION.—No compensation shall be payable by reason of paragraph (1) for any week beginning after August 30, 2003.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–147; 116 Stat. 21).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind Members why we are here today. We are here today to vote on an unemployment assistance bill because the House, in trying to respond to the needs of the

unemployed, passed legislation last December. The Senate, in attempting to respond to the needs of the unemployed, passed legislation last December. As we all know, constitutionally for it to go to the President, if the Senate passes legislation different than the House, and similarly if the House passes legislation different than the Senate, the differences in those bills need to be reconciled. They were not reconciled.

The last Congress adjourned without addressing unemployment needs with the understanding that some individuals, through no fault of their own, notwithstanding the fact that they had not received the full benefits entitled to them, would lose unemployment benefits on December 28. That is still technically the case. They have not yet lost those benefits, but if the President does not have a bill to sign by tomorrow, that technicality will in fact be a reality.

We are here today because the Senate modified the proposal that they had passed in the last Congress and they sent it to us yesterday by unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, I imagine there are as many different ways to structure unemployment benefits as there are Members of the House; and if we are to debate the different ways in which it can be constructed and if we are to offer votes to try to produce a different result than the Senate, then it is inevitable that what we are trying to avoid will in fact occur.

I, as a Member of this body, do not like being put in the position of making a statement of this type. We are compelled to pass the unemployment provision as it was structured by the Senate because if we do not the President will not have a bill tomorrow.

I had visited with the leadership of the Senate and talked to them about offering amendments so we could really target unemployment to where it is most needed, give those most in need more benefits. They indicated while they may be sympathetic with that view, there was no way given the structure of the Senate's membership and the rules of Senate that that could be done in a day.

What we were able to do was to extend the period that the Senate had passed so instead of getting into this discussion in March, once again we are extending for 5 months the unemployment benefits to May with a phase-out through August. That means that we are going to see a continuation of assistance to the unemployed. It means that the President's commitment to make sure that those who would have lost their benefits on December 28 does not happen, and it means that there are going to be 1.9 million new recipients and 800,000 current recipients that will receive unemployment benefits at a cost of up to \$7.2 billion when the House votes on this measure.

We are going to hear people say we could have, would have, should have,

and the argument is that they are being denied rights because they cannot offer alternatives. If we do not pass this measure, people will lose their unemployment benefits. That should not happen.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I do not take the floor again in this session of the 108th Congress and say we have to do what the Senate has given us. I only hope we do that because we want to do it. I believe this is the right thing to do. More importantly, it is absolutely essential that we do it and that we do it today rather than argue that somebody is trying to withhold these unemployment benefits from these individuals. All we have to do is say yes, the President will sign, and the unemployment benefits will be available.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) to control the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, news release, news release, news release. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has said that the Republican-controlled Senate and the Republican-controlled House cannot legislate, that they cannot provide for the one million Americans who are seeking jobs but whose unemployment compensation has expired. Who is going to deliver this message to the empowered Republican President who has now told the American people that he controls the agenda? And now we find out that the chairman of the awesome and powerful and influential Committee on Ways and Means cannot legislate in the people's House.

Well, I do not believe it. My colleagues do not believe it, and the only reason I am commenting on it is because I do not want the American people to believe it. We have a million people out there. They do not have dividends or savings; all they have is heart and are looking for work. They are Americans that will be called on to fight the wars. They have lost their jobs, lost health benefits, but they have not lost their dignity.

But we will have people to believe that somewhere down the line they will not have to pay taxes on their dividends and jobs will be created for them. The other side of the aisle says we would like to help them because of compassionate conservatism, but we just cannot do it.

We have majorities in the House and the Senate, but the House has to do what the Senate did; the Senate has to do what the House would do. Do not do this to these people. They should just say they do not want to do it because they do not believe in it. They did not do it before the Christmas holidays, and they are just giving a little interest today.

Mr. Speaker, so I do not know how the other side of the aisle is going to explain it back home, but I know one thing, and that is we have 84,000 New Yorkers. They took the hit for this Nation. They are looking for work. I will go back and tell them that we discussed it with the Republicans, and they said that Democrats and Republicans will not be able even to debate coverage for the 84,000 people who are without work who paid into the fund. I will tell them that we cannot even vote on it because we do not want to complicate it for the Republican-controlled Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for the purposes of control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the million worker comment made by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL). I think it is very important for us to know the history of what has already happened in the area of unemployment compensation and why we are going to add some additional assistance for people who come from States like mine.

The Democrats make it sound like we have not helped at all the unemployed, whom we already have helped. We have helped those million unemployed workers. We have helped them consistently through this last year. They make that assertion about the million people being let down, but already we have helped one million people under the Federal expanded benefits that we put into effect last year in March of 2002. They have all already received Federal unemployment benefits that averaged \$250 a week generally for 13 weeks. On top of that, generally 26 weeks of regular State benefits which they had received previously, and I think that is very important. In States like Washington State, my State, there have been additional expanded benefits.

So to talk about not helping one million folks who have been unemployed is to move from the truth, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is important to clear that up.

My second point is in addition to the one million folks, we are going to help two million additional people. Plus, we will be extending benefits that ran out on December 28 for 800,000 additional people. Let us not get mixed up in the rhetoric of partisanship here and let us talk about what we can do to help unemployed people who very much want to hold jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH).

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington

(Ms. DUNN) for all of her work on the issue of unemployment benefits because I know this has been a big focus of her efforts in this body for the last few months.

Mr. Speaker, last year Republican leadership in the House advanced a program of extended unemployment insurance which has assisted some four million Americans. Today we will be extending that critical program to help the millions of Americans who continue to face unemployment through no fault of their own.

□ 1200

These working families have borne the brunt of hard economic times and will continue to do so until our economy gets back on a growth path and begins to generate new jobs. We in Congress have a fundamental responsibility to help cushion the effects of economic displacement by providing a set of extended unemployment benefits for those who exhaust their regular State compensation. Under today's legislation, these workers who exhaust their 26 weeks of State benefits will be able to collect up to 13 more weeks of benefits; and in a couple of other States with very high unemployment, 13 more on top of that.

This program not only benefits working families but it also acts as an economic stabilizer for communities like the many that we have in western Pennsylvania that have been particularly hard hit by this downturn and its effect on the manufacturing sector, places like Erie, Warren, Meadville. These are communities where this program is going to be enormously beneficial to those who depend on jobs that are tied to the local economy.

Nonetheless, many Americans will continue to face difficulties as this economy recovers. For this reason I will be introducing legislation that reforms the trigger mechanism on extended benefits and that allows unemployed workers to receive up to 26 weeks of additional assistance. State unemployment numbers can mask big regional differences. I believe that a change in the trigger mechanism will allow us to more effectively respond to uneven economic recovery across the country within States.

I support the legislation before us. I believe that we need to continue to work to provide more relief for the unemployed where and when it is needed; and above all since these are workers who want a job, not just unemployment insurance, we need to pass a stimulus package that gets the economy back on a growth path.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out to the gentleman from Pennsylvania who is not allowed to put up an amendment. He is the only one I have ever heard of talk about exhaustees on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to speak further to clarify this issue that the gentlewoman from Washington has spoken about. There are a million people who exhausted their 13 weeks of extended benefits. There are 31,500 of them in your State. To the gentleman from Pennsylvania, 44,000 are in your State. In 1991, we provided 26 weeks of extended benefits. We did not need to change the trigger to do that.

We Democrats here today wanted to provide to those people an additional 13 weeks if they were still out of work. You keep talking about those who are out of work, who are hurting, who are looking for work. How about the million who have been out of work beyond the 39 weeks who are looking for work? Why do we not act today as we did 10 years ago? Why not? What is the obstacle? Is it because the Senate would have to act? All right. They would have to act. They are going to be in session. The Republicans control both Houses and the White House. This is a vivid example of those who have control not being willing to exercise it.

I understand covering one's tracks politically. We should have acted in December, and you failed to do it. But for the unemployed, it is not a question of covering tracks politically. It is covering the expenses day to day for food, for housing, and for health care if possible. There is no excuse for the refusal of the Republicans to let us bring extended benefits for the million of exhaustees up today. Zero excuse.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I would comment to the gentleman from Michigan that this assistance which we are providing in today's legislation will assist 86,000 new individuals from his State of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the issue is to get people back to work and for those that cannot find work, it is to help them out. The other side of the aisle opposed that.

One of the problems we have had in the past, in the Senate, we have had gridlock. James Carville wrote in a memo to the then-leader DASCHLE that he recommended two things: one, that the Senate not have a budget; two, that they gridlock all House bills.

The House passed an unemployment bill. It takes 60 votes in the Senate, unlike the House with a simple majority. Yes, we control the House and the Senate. We could pass the bill right here today. But in the Senate, the same Senate Democrats gridlock legislation, that would go forward in a bipartisan way.

We need to pull together on both sides of the aisle to make sure that the people that do not have work, work. But even more important, instead of handing out dollars to individuals, we need to create the jobs, whether it is tax relief which the President has offered. Not only long-term, instead of

just handing out money and having Davis-Bacon and unions reap the benefits of it, it creates jobs across the board and allows those same people, instead of having to receive benefits, will have a good job.

The gentlewoman from Washington has stated clearly that they have received both State and Federal moneys. That runs out, and we have got to come together today to make sure that that happens. Put aside the partisanship, and let us pass this bill.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman from California that under the Republican bill, that if you had exhausted your benefits under your bill, you would have gotten absolutely nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. There has been talk in recent months that if there is to be an economic recovery in our future, it will be a so-called "jobless recovery." I would submit that for the 8.5 million Americans who are currently unemployed, an economic recovery that does not provide jobs is no recovery at all. The Economic Policy Institute has reported that using even optimistic projections of the gross domestic product, the unemployment rate is expected to remain at 6 percent for all of 2003. An analysis projecting less optimistic growth numbers suggests the unemployment rate will climb to 6.4 percent by the last quarter of this year.

However, there is one factor that impacts the severity of the current downturn for American workers more than any other. That is, significantly more workers have exhausted their Federal benefits since the Federal extension of benefit program began in March than ran out of Federal benefits over a comparable number of months in the recession of the early nineties. Under the Federal extension program of the early nineties, each worker was eligible for 20 to 26 weeks of benefits some 10 months after the program was enacted. Under the program which just expired at the end of December, most workers were eligible for a maximum of 13 weeks of benefits. As a result, by the end of December, an estimated 2.2 million workers had exhausted all of their Federal benefits. And without congressional assistance, the new year brings these 2.2 million unemployed a job market that is stripped bare. It is a job market with 1.5 million fewer jobs than in March of 2001.

It is for this reason that it is critical that the Federal unemployment insurance system be extended now. However, the majority plan and the Democratic proposal, which was disallowed, offer two very different levels of compensation to American families. The majority plan would provide for 13 weeks of extended benefits over the next 5 months to the estimated 90,000 workers a week who will exhaust their State benefits without finding work. The Democratic plan would have offered 26 weeks.

I want to say that there is a difference in the economic benefit to families. We need to make sure that families have some of this uncertainty lifted from them. It is not enough to just say, well, another 13 weeks. This country has the money for a longer extension. Families should not have to wonder if they are going to have the ability to pay their mortgage or to buy clothes or to put food on the table. We have an obligation to the unemployed, and that is why I am supporting our Democratic proposal.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would remind the gentleman from Ohio that our unemployment compensation assistance provided last year, from his State we assisted 123,000 individuals. And with the passage of today's bill, which is very important to be passed on the floor today, signed by the President tomorrow so there is no gap in assistance from December 28, we will be assisting an additional 61,600 folks from the State of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

(Mr. FATTAH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make the point that it is not the assistance that we are providing, that this is assistance that the American public has paid for through their unemployment contributions to the fund. I just share the concerns of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the principal thing that people are talking about, particularly the President of this country, is a \$600 billion economic stimulus plan. Yet here we are at the same time debating whether we should help a million families whose breadwinner has been out of work, who has been searching for work, whether we should provide them 38 percent of the income that they had been getting from their job to put food on the table for their families.

And if we do not extend this, what happens to those families? Think about the faces behind the statistics. They stop payment on their mortgage. They have to pull their kids out of college. All kinds of suffering we cannot imagine. Yet we can put up \$600 billion in tax cuts instead of providing five percent of that amount for people who would spend that money immediately.

Any economic stimulus needs to be fast acting, it needs to be fiscally responsible, and it needs to be fair. What could be fairer than providing the unemployment insurance for those people who have exhausted their benefits? All we asked for was an opportunity to

vote on whether or not we could and should do that. We were denied that opportunity to vote.

We are going to vote for extending unemployment insurance for the part of the people who will be helped by this, but it is not the population that needs it the most. That is what we should be doing today, providing economic stimulus to the people who need it the most, who have been hard working, who are suffering because we have the highest unemployment rate we have had for 9 years, who cannot find a job. So let us let them keep being able to feed their families, keep their homes until they find that job, until the economy recovers.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is very important for us, Mr. Speaker, to debate, and we will debate over the ensuing months, an economic growth plan that will stimulate the economy and create more jobs. Everybody right now on unemployment wishes that he or she had a job. We are going to have that debate. It is vitally important. Today we are debating what we can do in the interim to assist people who, not by their own choice, are out of a job.

We are talking about a \$7 billion piece of legislation today that will assist a huge number of folks who were not covered before by unemployment compensation. We have already spent \$19 billion with assistance last year. I think it is vitally important that we continue the debate on this bill so we can get passage of it on the floor today, combined with the piece of legislation passed by the Senate yesterday, and get it to the President tomorrow so we can begin to help people whose unemployment benefits ended on December 28; and we can do this without disruption in the dollars they will receive so they can have some peace of mind as they move through this very, very tough time in their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

□ 1215

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more critical right now than responding to the very critical needs of our unemployed. We have almost a million people in this country who are unemployed, and for us to sit here and dally and not move forthright and push for the strongest measure we can, the people of this country are crying out for help. There are families to feed, there are bills to be paid, and we know we were derelict in our responsibilities not to do this last year, and it will be a shame if we do not move forcefully. Not just 13 weeks, we need 26 weeks of help at least, mainly because every economic adviser, every economic indicator, points out clearly that this economic downturn is going to last well into the next year.

Thirteen weeks is not enough. Furthermore, if we do it for 26 weeks, it will pump an immediate \$18 billion into the economy where people would be able to spend it, where the need is greatest, and not only will it do the good of helping those with their unemployment benefits, but by doing this, pumping the \$18 billion in, it will create badly needed jobs. The greatest need right now is not to dally, and with all due respect to the present administration, I say 13 weeks is not enough. We need 26 weeks. The people of this country are crying out for help, and they are looking to us in the Congress to speak with a loud voice for them.

I urge this House to move forthrightly, do the right thing. Let us not go home this week without passing the most significant resourceful bill we can that will help those in the greatest need.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I retain the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I listened to my distinguished colleague from the State of Washington, and she had this list, and she said that the Republican bill helped 134,000 members or something in the State. I have my list here, which is the list of all those people we do not help, and the question is why can we not do that? I mean the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) and I have 31,500 people that this bill does nothing for. They are the people who exhausted their benefits. I know she cares about them. I am absolutely sure she does, and I care about them, but we are told that we cannot do anything about it because the Senate has acted unanimously.

I am sorry, but I have been in legislatures, State legislatures, the House and Senate, and I have been here in the House, and I have been doing this for 30 years, and I have seen things go through legislatures in an hour through both houses, no problem, if you want to do something. Of course if you do not want to do something, then you say, oh, the heavy burdens of the legislative process, the Senate has acted, the House has acted, oh, we cannot get it done, the President must have it on his desk tomorrow at 11 o'clock, that is the time his press conference is, I think, so he can sign it at the press conference tomorrow to put it out.

Now for those 31,000 people in the State of Washington that the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) and I care about, we are just saying to them we do not have time because the press release is already printed. I am sorry, folks. It might take an extra 3 or 4 hours to get the House and Senate to get it done, but have no fear, 31,000 people, the President has you on his mind,

deeply on his mind. He went to Chicago to make the speech about how big and how heavy his heart was about your problems. He is proposing to put \$674 billion into the economy, not to you of course, no, unless you have capital gains that you might benefit a little bit from his bill, but it is really for the rich people on the top. They are going to get 75 percent of it, and then they will think up some way to put you to work. So hold on and we will pass this tax bill and then in April of 2004 when they got this money back, then they are going to invest it and make you a job. So if you can hold your breath for a year for that tax break to take hold, why, things are going to be all right.

And the worst thing about this whole process, why it is an empty promise the President is making, is that in today's newspaper there is an article entitled *War's Cost May Dwarf Stimulus Effect*, from the Washington Post, January 8. This article says that as long as this country is threatening the whole world with the war in the Middle East that what is going to happen is that we are going to suck all the juice out of the stimulus package by the war.

The gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) and I represent an air company that makes airplanes. Last year they made 400 and some odd planes. Do my colleagues know what their orders are for this year? Two hundred twenty-one. Now, why are airlines not buying airplanes? Well, it probably has something to do with the fact that people are not flying. They are not getting on planes and flying all over the world like they used to. So this war on terrorism that is scaring the living day-lights out of the travelers is knocking the jobs out. We have lost 30,000 jobs at Boeing this last couple of years. And the President says, yes, but we are going to Iraq and we are going to have a war there and that is going to fix it all, and then after that Iraq war everybody will feel comfortable again and we will go back to living the way we have always lived.

Nonsense. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) was right. We are going to be back here in 3 months with this very same bill or something just like it because you are not going to get a stimulus in 90 days and you certainly would not want to have this linger on into the next election period. You had better have something on the table for them. Maybe you will wait until this time next year to put a little something more on the table, but by then there will be a million more. The long-term unemployment in the State of Washington has risen by 35 percent in the last 2 years, 35 percent. I admit we are the point persons, Washington and Oregon, for the unemployment problem in this country; so we have got it a little worse than the rest of you, but if you think it is not going to affect you, that somehow you are going to slide by this thing, you are wrong, and to say here today that we have not got an extra hour to add an amendment to

take care of a million people and then ship it back over to the Senate and say would they please accept the House amendment, I have done it. I am sure I have done it 500 times in the last 30 years, to send an amendment over and it gets accepted and that is the end of it. You know you could do it. You do not want to do it. You do not want to do it. You do not care about those million people. No matter what you say or how you wave your arms and whatever you want to say, the Republican Party does not care about those million unemployed because you have the Presidency, you have the Senate, and you have the House, and if you cannot do it, you have two choices, I guess. You could be stupid and not know how to do it. That is one possibility. I do not think that is true. The alternative is you do not want to do it. You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 8, 2003]

WAR'S COST MAY DWARF STIMULUS EFFECT
(By Jonathan Weisman)

Mindful of his pending reelection bid and his father's political mistakes, President Bush is plowing ahead with an ambitious 10-year, \$674 billion economic stimulus plan even as U.S. troops pour into the Persian Gulf region preparing for war.

The president's determination to push more tax cuts as the nation prepares for war has struck some economists as folly, since the economic shock of war would likely dwarf the impact of Bush's stimulus plan. Moreover, no tax policy at the moment could actually address what many economists believe to be the greatest drag on the nation's economy: the uncertainty of war.

"Clearing away the clouds over Iraq would open the paths for expansion, regardless of what the Bush administration is proposing," said Robert DiClemente, a managing director at Salomon Smith Barney who has studied the potential impact of an Iraq war on the U.S. economy. "That is undoubtedly the biggest obstacle to expansion right now."

Bush was explicit about his two-track policymaking yesterday, beginning his speech in Chicago by addressing the threats of terrorism, Iraq and North Korea. He then added, "Even as we confront these dangers, you need to know I know we have needs here at home, especially the need for a vigorous and growing economy."

But it is becoming increasingly difficult to address those domestic needs without first confronting the problems abroad, economists said. The goal of the president's plan is to inject \$102 billion into the economy this year, by accelerating planned income tax cuts, excluding investment dividends from taxation, boosting the child tax credit and speeding tax relief to married couples. The elimination of dividend taxes alone could boost the stock market by 10 percent, according to White House allies.

But all of that could be undone by a war in the oil-rich Persian Gulf region, especially if the war were protracted and led to terrorist attacks and the use of weapons of mass destruction. Last month, Yale University economist William D. Nordhaus published an analysis that dramatized the uncertainties the United States faces. The cost to the Treasury of a war with Iraq could be as low as \$100 billion over the next decade or as high as \$1.6 trillion, he concluded. Most likely, the economy would take a \$391 billion hit in the next two years, Nordhaus predicted, which would dwarf the cash infusion the president is offering.

"If energy prices spike up, it wouldn't take much to offset all of this stimulus," said William G. Gale, a tax economist at the Brookings Institution.

A recent analysis by experts convened by the Center for Strategic and International Studies predicted that any war would knock down stock prices by as much as 25 percent, more than undoing the anticipated benefit of the dividend tax elimination.

Recovery would depend on how a war with Iraq unfolded. If the war ended swiftly, stocks and the economy as a whole would recover quickly and grow at a rate faster than they would if there were no war, thanks to the lifting of uncertainty, falling oil prices, higher government spending and rising consumer confidence. In that event, the Bush plan could end up harming the economy by fueling inflation or pushing interest rates higher, said Laurence Meyer, a former Federal Reserve Board governor who convened the CSIS conference.

But if the war lasted six to 12 weeks, stock prices would continue to fall, interest rates would rise and economic growth would slow by 1¼ percent, the CSIS analysis said. A worst-case scenario—in which the war dragged on for 90 to 180 days, oil supplies were significantly disrupted, and serious terrorists attacks ensued—would push the economy back into recession, regardless of economic policymaking.

In that case, the economic response would probably be far different from the one Bush is proposing now, Meyer said. That range of potential outcomes makes policymaking at this point "treacherous," he said.

"The best policy right now is to wait, to see what happens ahead, and to plan in the background some contingency plans, just in case we have an adverse outcome," Meyer said.

Not everyone is so cautious. DiClemente said the Bush proposal could provide a buffer for the shocks that would come from a war. Bruce Bartlett, a conservative economist with the National Center for Policy Analysis, noted that a war with Iraq could be long over by the time Congress passed a stimulus plan. In that case, he said, Bush might as well get the ball rolling now.

But, for the president's critics, the timing and boldness of the Bush plan present an irresistible target.

"Whenever the president talks about war, he talks about a spirit of shared sacrifice," Gale said. "But for rich people, shared sacrifice appears to be accepting tax cuts, and for the poor, it seems to be accepting cuts in social spending. There seems to be a disconnect bordering on the dishonest."

Fumed Rep. Charles B. Rangel (N.Y.), the ranking Democrat on the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee, "Never in a time of war have we reduced the tax burden on the most privileged."

Even some of Bush's allies in past tax fights expressed exasperation yesterday, given the gathering clouds of war.

"I understand you can't just put everything on the back burner and ignore it," said Sen. John Breaux (D-La.), a key ally in the battle over the president's 2001 tax cut. "But what you can do is take modest steps, and \$670 billion is more than modest."

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to remind the gentleman from Washington of what the situation was last fall when we began to debate the extension of unemployment compensation. The leading plan was one that was proposed by

his party on the Senate side. It was a \$5 billion plan. It called for a 3-month extension of unemployment benefits. It called for an additional 3-month phase-out. What we have done in the interim, led by people who are from States like Alaska and Oregon and Washington, States where we are very, very concerned about our extremely high level of unemployment, not led by people from Virginia, where the unemployment rate is something like 3.8 percent over the last 3 months, or Georgia, where the unemployment rate is 4.6 percent, low unemployment rates never thought to be even possible to achieve by economists in years past, but we have put together a piece of legislation which considering the state of our economy is a generous piece of legislation. It takes care of an additional 2 million people who were not helped before. It extends benefits for some 800,000 folks nationwide whose benefits were interrupted on December 28, and this is specifically Federal dollars I am talking about. I am not including the State unemployment programs.

We are at the point where we have a 5-month extension that we are providing of unemployment benefits to folks who have been put out of their jobs through no choice of their own plus a 3-month phaseout of these benefits, plus we are helping an additional 800,000 whose benefits are interrupted. So this is a bill that is almost twice as much, certainly almost twice as much as what we were talking about last fall. It is generous, and I think it is a very good bill, and I think the fact that as we pass it today, as it is signed into law by the President tomorrow, that will allow for no interruption in the receipt of Federal unemployment benefits by people in the States. We are also assisting States so that they can use their funds later, not at the beginning.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON).

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) for her leadership on this issue.

The recovery is not as strong as any of us would like, and there are people who are out of jobs through no fault of their own. While our first priority has to be to get this economy back on a strong positive note, get the recovery to be stronger so that people have jobs and have paychecks, all of us know that we need to help people over the hump from their last job to their next job because they are desperate and because they do not have the kinds of options that they may have had in better economic times. That is why we are here. That is why we are doing this. All of us have constituents who ran out of benefits on December 28, and we need to act quickly so that those benefits will not be interrupted and they will be able to make the payments on their house, pay the rent, put food on the table.

The gentleman from the State of Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) said

what this really means, this vote really means, is that we just do not care. And he said it is a shame we do not care. I think it is a shame that a Member of this body would make that kind of accusation. We are here because we care and because we understand that there are real people and real lives at stake. This Congress will pass today, with the unanimous support of the United States Senate and I think with a broad bipartisan support here in the House, benefits extensions that will take us through June so that we can work on recovering this economy and get people back to paychecks but in the meantime make sure they can pay for the food to put on their table and take care of their families.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I guess if we look at what was proposed by the Republican majority today versus what was proposed last year, this is generous because this proposal that we have before us provides 13 weeks of unemployment compensation for about a million Americans. Last year the Republicans proposed a 5-week extension not for every American in every State but in only three States. Three States last year would have received unemployment benefit compensation for some of its workers.

□ 1230

Today, we are hearing more. That is absolutely correct.

What has changed between that proposal, which was puny, to today's, which is a more realistic proposal? Well, we had 800,000 Americans cut off from all of their benefits on December 28; and every week since then about 90,000 Americans, in addition, have been losing their unemployment benefits. And between now and June, we are going to see about another 2.5 million Americans run out of unemployment benefits.

So yes, it is more generous; but it does not take into account all of the millions of Americans who are going to be left out. And that is why we are saying, if nothing else, let us just have an up-or-down vote.

Why is it that Americans who probably will never get a chance to see this debate will not know that the Republican majority of this House used the rules of the House to deny just a vote on whether we could extend the benefits to those other Americans who are going to be left out by this bill? If we lose, we lose. But give Americans a chance to know that we tried to help them as well. If we lose, so be it. Let us go back home and tell them that we could not get a majority of Members of Congress to support extending benefits to more than a million Americans who have run out of their benefits, who are seeking work and trying to put food on the table for their kids. Why can we

not do this? We do this all the time. We put together amendments, as the gentleman from Washington said, in minutes. It would not even take that, because we have the language before us that we would need to extend those benefits to the more than 1 million Americans.

I have to go home now to California and tell more than 109,000 Americans that we did not extend benefits to them, while some of their coworkers who are out of work did get it. It makes no sense. What can I tell them? Well, you lost your job a little earlier than did your colleague who is getting benefits. That makes no sense. Everyone is working hard.

By the way, if we are talking about stimulus, instead of the President spending \$700 billion-or-so over 15 years to give investors money to try to stimulate the economy, give it to those who are out of work who otherwise would be spending their money if they were working to put food on the table, buy the necessities, pay the rent, pay the mortgage. That would stimulate the economy instead of having them run out of those things that are essential to the economy. We can do it, there is no reason why we cannot, and the American public should know that we can.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues for their diligent work in bringing this piece of legislation to the floor. It is certainly an admirable goal that we seek to achieve here today, trying to bring some relief to the people who find themselves unemployed in this economy, and I intend to support the legislation.

I must, however, say that there is a bit of irony here that I wanted to bring to the attention of the body, and that is that we are debating what we should do to help people who are unemployed. Again, appropriate. But we have steadfastly refused as a body and, as a matter of fact, as a government, to debate one other aspect of this, and that is the fact that many people are unemployed today in the United States because there are people here from other countries, here illegally, I should say, who have taken jobs. It is not just those jobs that we hear about all the time from people who say, well, there are jobs Americans will not take. I assure my colleagues, we can go to any factory town in America, we can go to any of the States that are identified in this bill that have significant unemployment, and we can find out whether or not people are willing to accept jobs that "others will not take."

I assure my colleagues, American citizens are willing to do so, citizens who are willing to take jobs that are being taken by people with H1B visas, people who are willing to take jobs from people who are here, as I say, illegally, and are working in menial jobs

with low wages. There are still many American citizens willing to take jobs that are being taken by between 8 million and 13 million people who are here illegally; and we refuse to debate that point while we come here today, of course, to do again, what I say is the right thing to do, and I will support it. But it is just an irony that I wanted to bring to the attention of the body. There is an aspect of this that we steadfastly, both sides, both parties, refuse to debate, and that is a shame.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman from Colorado that according to the U.S. Department of Labor, for every job opening, there are 2.7 applicants. So if the problem is immigration, I do not know quite how we are going to fix this. We already have too many people looking for jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, it was bad enough when the Republicans adjourned Congress and went home for the holidays without doing the work of taking care of those who were unemployed through no fault of their own, hard-working Americans; but it is worse, it is a darker dereliction of duty to today bring a bill to the floor and refuse to allow an honest debate by America's representatives to truly cover the unemployed. That is a darker dereliction of duty, and it is darker because while the Republican Party says that there is no money in the Treasury to cover \$2 billion to \$4 billion to take care of people who are out of work, the day before that, the President said, but we have \$400 billion to give out to the wealthiest Americans. It is a dark day for democracy.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we had all of these new Members of Congress who came here and they stood right here and they looked right up at their grandparents and their kids and they waved and they were really proud, rightfully so, to be Members of the people's House, because they knew that they were in a place that the entire world looks to for the practice of democracy. But on the first day of business, they are here for the shutdown of democracy. They are here where the Republican Party is basically saying to Americans, you poor peasants, take it or leave it. We are putting a bill out here, and you can take it or leave it. We are not going to allow an improved bill even to be voted on. That is a callous dereliction of the oath of office to democracy.

Now, I rarely get exercised about procedural issues. I do not think Americans could give two hoots normally about what happens procedurally here in the House and we spend too much time arguing about it is. But when we bring a substantive bill to the floor and tell people who are out of work who

cannot make their house payments, who cannot make their kids' tuition payments, that you are going to give them a take-it-or-leave-it proposal and if they do not like it, they can just walk out of here and sulk, that is simply wrong. It is wrong for democracy. I am not going to go down without raising my voice.

Mr. Speaker, up here we have Hamarabi, a bust of him for creating a great legal code, and now his country is ruled by a tyrant, Saddam Hussein.

Things can go backwards in democracy. This is a step backwards in the democratic process.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would remind the gentleman from Washington State that just late last fall, I think in December, senior Members of his own party leadership were talking about what a wonderful bill the unemployment bill was that then was far less generous than what we would like to do today. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for example, last fall said, "Tomorrow the House will meet one more time before adjourning for the year. We could simply take up the bipartisan Senate bill which has the 3-month extension and agree to it unanimously. That action would send a positive signal about our willingness to work together to solve our economic problems."

I submit that this additional 2-month extension, our bill is 5 months, plus a 3-month phaseout that assists 2 million additional people, is far more generous. So I think a dark day is perhaps not the right characterization for what we are doing today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART).

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I stand before my colleagues today supportive, clearly, of extending unemployment benefits. I represent parts of six counties in western Pennsylvania; and we have seen the unemployment rate rise, as others have in this body. But to call what we are doing today a dereliction of duty seems to me to be silly and extreme, and completely inaccurate.

A dereliction of duty would be to today avoid passing what the Senate has passed unanimously to extend unemployment benefits to those who are in danger of losing them. If, in fact, we pass this bill today, it will go directly to the President, the President can sign the bill, and that will prevent the interruption of benefits for those who will have those benefits interrupted if we are derelict in our duty.

Being derelict in our duty would be to not pass this bill today to fight what the Senate has unanimously approved, the Senators, who were elected as we were, by the people of the 50 States, sent here to do the best we can for them. This House has agreed that we should, without hesitation, pass an unemployment extension for those who are still in need.

It only makes sense for us today to unanimously, as a body, support those

who right now cannot support their families. It is our duty to do so.

My colleagues who have spoken prior to me have explained the generous benefit that is available in this bill. Clearly, the Senators debated it yesterday, with our families here, on the day of swearing in. All I heard yesterday from the folks who came here from my district was, that is a great thing for you to do. Please do it and do it forthwith. Get it done. The people need the help.

Mr. Speaker, a unanimous approval by the House today will show the American people that we are here to do business together, Republicans and Democrats, to make sure that we will not be derelict in the duty of making sure the American people get the benefits they need, and then continue working on the economy to make sure that those people will have a job once these benefits expire in several months.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania tell those 44,000 people in Pennsylvania to hold on, hold on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as I look at this bill, it is too little and, for many, almost too late. Almost too late for them to avoid absolute disaster. As a matter of fact, I pulled out one of my old records the other day and was listening to it, and it said, every morning about this time, when I get to the breakfast table, my wife is there crying, get a job, get a job, that I could not find. Then the other part says, I read the paper through and through trying to see if there is any work for me to do; and, of course, in many instances, the individuals come up short.

The real deal is that if one represents a district like mine, over the last 30 years, we have lost more than 120,000 good-paying manufacturing jobs that are gone, that do not exist. Unemployment in many of the communities that I represent is 20 to 25 percent. So if we want to stimulate the economy, what do we do? Put some money in the pockets of those individuals so that they can go to the grocery store and buy a loaf of bread, so that they can get a gallon of milk, so that they can have something to plow back into the economy, to keep it moving, to keep it turning. Do not go to the top; stimulate the bottom. Then we can really stimulate the economy.

I would hope that 27 weeks would be the very minimum that we could do for some of the people who have been out of work even for 26 months. I am not sure that some have not been out for 26 years. We can do better than what we are proposing.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of extending the Federal unemployment benefits. Everyone has heard

about the impact of the current recession on all of our constituents. The country, and especially my City of New York, continues to suffer from recession in part due to the terrorist attacks of 9-11 on our fair city, but in greater part, I believe, due to the economic policies of this White House, highlighted by the President's so-called economic stimulus plan.

The effects of this Bush recession have been devastating for far too many once-hard-working men and women, effects such as an economy that has shed 69,000 jobs a month and 2,000 jobs a day. New York State alone has lost over 502,000 jobs and workers. New York City has lost 281,000 jobs. New Yorkers want to work and provide for their families with good-paying jobs, but until America adopts responsible economic policies, these jobs will not be forthcoming.

For an economy to lose 69,000 jobs a month and 2,000 jobs a day since Mr. Bush has become President, the only answer is a jobs package and not a gift to the wealthy. This economy needs a shot in the arm and not a kick in the pants, which the Bush White House has given to the American people.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA).

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I sat here and listened in amazement as my Republican colleagues came crying crocodile tears for the poor unemployed who lost their benefits as of December 28. As I recall, back before we adjourned in November the Senate sent an identical bill over here, but the Republican House leadership chose not to take it up and instead went home; so the House Republicans created this situation which now they decry as the poor unemployed workers, something that they actually caused.

But the problem even after we pass this bill is that they are forgetting about in excess of 1 million people whose benefits have expired that we could extend for another 13 weeks, knowing full well that the money is there. If this country has \$674 billion in additional tax cuts for people other than these unemployed, surely we have a couple of billion for the million unemployed workers and their families who get no money today.

So we are saying that the bill before us is incomplete. Add the rest of the people who are hurting and we have done a better job. Yes, we can do that in 2 seconds. The Senate will adopt it unanimously, and the President can sign it tomorrow.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will remind the gentleman from Wisconsin that 37,000 people would likely be helped by this additional bill; and also remind him that that piece of legislation we looked at

very late and very briefly last fall was a provision that was far less expansive than this one. In the time that we have had in order to put together legislation on which the Senate and the House together would agree and the President would sign, we have come up with a larger program that extends unemployment benefits for 5 months with a phaseout of 3 months, and I think a far better piece of legislation, I am sure the gentleman from Wisconsin would agree.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA).

Mr. KLECZKA. The gentlewoman from Washington is correct, Mr. Speaker, 37,000 people from Wisconsin will benefit under the bill, 37,000 that they cut off because we went home. However, let us worry about the other 22,000 who have been let go. I represent the City of Milwaukee, and I bet the bulk of those people come from the City of Milwaukee and have no income today.

So yes, I am with them on the 37,000, but why are they shafting the 22,000 who get nothing under this bill?

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to something my friend, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN), said about the basic improvement in this bill, or improvement in the Republicans' position since last year.

I think she is correct in what happened, that when the Republicans had a penurious proposal last year and then went home without adopting one, and caught heck when they went home, they improved their position. This is a better bill, I want to agree with her on that.

But there is another group that is being abused by this failure today, not just the unemployed. It is the unrepresented. Because when we bring a bill to the floor where two or three people get into a room and decide what the bill is going to be, and bring it out to this floor and tell the American people that that is their only solution, that is a form of tyranny. It is a step down the road to a government that does not respect democracy.

Unfortunately, it is the first time it is happening, and it is going to happen over and over and over again during this Congress. That is why I am here today raising my voice against it, saying that we cannot have a democracy if we bring a bill to the floor and do not have an alternative for the American people to consider. It is the wrong thing to do.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, the unemployment rate in my State is 6.6 percent. That is a hugely, incredibly large

number of folks who, through no fault of their own, have found themselves without jobs. This is occurring in many States around the Nation.

The attempt we are making today, which is a huge assistance to folks who are out of jobs, a bill that totals \$7 billion, that includes 2 million additional people who will be assisted, 2 million people who will be assisted through additional help over the 4 million who we have already helped through our legislation that provided benefits last year, is hugely important.

In my own State, Washington State, many layoffs have been due to the aerospace industry. The adverse impact of the economy on our aerospace industry concerns me, because I have thousands of aerospace workers who live in my district. I do not want to see them without jobs. If they are without jobs, I want to help to stimulate the economy so they will not much longer be without jobs. But the fact is, they are now.

I am very pleased that we are beginning this new session of Congress by heading in the right direction by providing much needed benefits to all Americans who are out of jobs. Under this legislation, unemployed workers who had Federal unemployment benefits that remained after December 28, when, by the way, we had put into place on the floor of the House a 5-week extension which would overlap into this session, so we could take a look and see what additional work we needed to do, which is what we are doing today, these folks will now receive the balance of their benefits. It is very important to those whose benefits were interrupted.

Further, workers who exhaust the regular State unemployment benefits in the coming months will become eligible for up to 13 weeks of Federal benefits in all States and up to 26 weeks in States like mine that have high unemployment, as we do in Washington State. In my State, this will help 56,000 additional people. That is 2.7 million people all over the country who are recipients of unemployment benefits who need help. These are folks who are still looking for jobs.

I think we need to put ourselves in their place. I think we need to feel how they feel when they need to meet a mortgage, to pay for the costs of food and heat in their homes. This is a vitally important piece of legislation that we are discussing today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this vitally important bill. I know there is debate on what additions we could make to this, but this is a generous bill and it is going to help a lot of people in my State and other States around the Nation. It is going to assist almost 2 million additional people today, in addition to the 4 million we have assisted in the past through other provisions that were passed last year.

I think it is a generous piece of legislation, and I think it is an imperative

as we begin the debate to stimulate this economy and create those jobs that folks right now would like to be holding.

I have great faith in this body. I know that we will do the right thing: that we will pass this piece of legislation today so in coordination with the Senate we may send this to the President, so by tomorrow he can sign this bill, and create no interruption in the Federal benefits received by folks whose benefits were stopped on December 28.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think all that needs to be said has been said already, but I would only emphasize the fact that what we are hearing today is what we heard from the Supreme Court of the United States at the time of the election of the President. The Supreme Court said, we do not have time to count the votes. We have to declare a winner here.

In this instance, we are telling a million people out there that we do not have time to do anything about extending their benefits. If they happened to run out of them last year, well, that is just tough luck. I guess they can wait for the economy to pick up, and we wish them well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this "day late and dollar short" Republican bill.

I fear that a lot of desperate families back in Springfield, North Hampton, and Milford, MA, are watching this debate today with confusion and anxiety. Well over 2,000 families of displaced workers in my district lost their unemployment compensation on December 28. Those desperate families, who thought losing their job in an economic slump was plenty to deal with, encountered even more pain with the loss of their financial life-line during the holidays.

Almost a million families around the country today, who are struggling to get back into the workplace, will not see their benefits resume if this bill is enacted.

In a successful effort to provide fewer benefits to fewer workers, the leaders of this House scuttled any chances for meaningful relief back in December when we knew this crisis was upon us.

What we are asking for in our substitute is not unusual. Congress has previously acted to temporarily extend unemployment benefits during periods of economic recession of high employment. And, unfortunately, the Nation reached an 8-year high for unemployment in November, 2002.

While the majority has recently decided that extending these benefits is the right thing to do, this bill is literally too little and too late. I urge my colleagues to support the substitute providing more financial security to more dis-

placed workers. Every penny we provide to the families of laid-off workers goes right back into the economy. Support this economic stimulus proposal.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I regret that Congress did not pass an extension of unemployment benefits last year. Last November, the other body passed a bill that cost \$5 billion and would have provided 13 weeks of additional UI benefits to jobless Americans. The House passed a paltry bill that cost \$900 million that would have extended benefits only through the end of January.

I'm delighted that this bill is closer to the one that was proposed by the Democrats in the other body last year. The bill we are considering today costs \$7.6 billion and it extends unemployment benefits through the end of May. It gives an additional 13 weeks of unemployment benefits to jobless Americans who have exhausted their 26 weeks of unemployment benefits. I am pleased that the bill is retroactive to December 28, so that those who had their benefits cut off on this date would receive the remainder of the 13 weeks owed to them.

Even though the bill is an improvement over last year's attempt, it is not enough. The bill excludes from coverage one million Americans who have exhausted their unemployment benefits and who have not found a job. These people will not be eligible for the extended benefits proposed under this bill, and they need our help. But this bill slams the door shut on their need for extended benefits.

This action should come as no surprise. The majority has consistently voted to exclude segments of the unemployed from receiving jobless benefits. Although the majority has changed the scope of coverage of the bill, it has not had a change of heart. At a time when we need national unity, the majority party continues to pit Americans against their fellow Americans. The economic policies of this Administration and the majority party of this chamber pits the well-off against the not-so-well off, working Americans against the jobless, and the jobless with benefits against those without.

While I support the passage of S. 23, I encourage my colleagues to support the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Washington, Mr. McDERMOTT. We can do more to assist those 1 million unemployed Americans who need our help, and we should take this opportunity to do so.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise today in support of S. 23, a bill to extend unemployment benefits for thousands of Americans.

Every day, too many American workers are exhausting their unemployment benefits and must use their retirement savings or make other sacrifices just to cover basic living expenses. More than 800,000 people have already exhausted their 13 weeks of extended unemployment insurance benefits that were provided in the economic stimulus legislation enacted in March, which means they have no federal assistance as they search for new jobs.

In my home State of Hawaii, over 23,540 workers are currently unemployed, and 3,100 workers who have exhausted their extended unemployment benefits in 2002 remain unemployed. Over 1,800 workers in Hawaii could lose their benefits because the State of Hawaii must cut off extended unemployment benefits

unless we continue the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation (TEUC) program.

I am pleased that the 108th Congress is passing legislation to retroactively extend unemployment compensation to laid-off workers who have exhausted their normal benefits. Congress has an obligation to make sure individuals who believed they would receive 13 weeks of extended benefits are not arbitrarily denied these benefits because the TEUC program expired on December 28.

When I was elected by the people of Hawaii, I quickly committed myself to helping working family struggling to survive this recession. I decided to join with my Democratic colleagues to introduce legislation to extend unemployment benefits for those who were going to lose their benefits because Congress failed to extend the TEUC program.

I wish the House could pass the Democratic proposal because it would give every worker 26 weeks of extended unemployment benefits, up from 13 weeks under the current program. During the last recession in the early 1990s, Congress provided 26 weeks of extended benefits, and struggling families need this type of temporary assistance once again. The Democratic proposal would help the 1 million American workers who have already exhausted their extended unemployment benefits.

Nevertheless, I reluctantly support S. 23. Unemployed American workers need our help. We must immediately pass this legislation and then develop a comprehensive economic program to help unemployed workers and stimulate our struggling economy.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, although with great hesitancy, I rise today in support of this overdue legislation to extend unemployment benefits. I had greatly hoped that Congress would have passed this extension prior to adjournment of the 107th Congress. I also am very disappointed that the bill before us today does not extend 26 weeks of extended benefits to all unemployed workers. However, I will vote in favor of S. 23 because we must expedite the extension of unemployment benefits.

As we all well know, and as I hope the American people are aware, last year, before the 107th Congress adjourned, and fully cognizant that the expiration deadline of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation, TEUC, program was fast approaching, the majority refused to act on a good compromise bill that the Senate had passed unanimously. As a result, the TEUC program expired on December 28, 2002, and with it so did federal unemployment benefits for more than 800,000 jobless Americans. In New Mexico, that delay meant 2,200 families lost their benefits.

S. 23 is certainly a step in the right direction. It is imperative that we extend these benefits as the sluggish economy struggles to regain the vibrancy and growth it experienced under the previous administration. The unemployment rate has climbed from 4.2 percent when President Bush was inaugurated to 6.0 percent today. Additionally, there are now 8 million unemployed Americans.

However, while the bill before us is a good start, I vow to continue fighting for passage of the comprehensive unemployment Federal benefits bill offered by Representatives RANGEL, CARDIN, and LEVIN, that would guarantee at least 26 weeks of extended benefits and

would expand access to unemployment benefits for workers who are low-wage earners or work part time. I am greatly disappointed that the rule stipulating the guidelines for debate over this legislation precluded us from debating Mr. RANGEL's substitute.

It is worth noting, that during the recession of the early 1990s the first President Bush signed into law the unemployment benefit extensions. It is estimated, however, that 800,000 more workers than during the 90s are expecting to exhaust their benefits this year. As such, it is clear to me that there is a need to extend the benefits beyond the 13 weeks provided by this bill.

Nevertheless, I will vote in support of S. 23, but do so with the hope that the leadership of the House and Senate will take up additional legislation to further extend unemployment benefits during this slow economic growth period.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to reluctantly support this bill. Today the House must once again come together to provide relief to America's unemployed. The president says that the economy is improving, but those words are cold comfort to those who have not only lost their jobs but also their unemployment benefits in recent weeks. These folks have been left with no job or assistance and are struggling to provide for their families this winter.

Unfortunately, this bill only extends unemployment benefits for workers who had not yet exhausted their 13 weeks before the program expired in December, doing nothing for those who exhausted their benefits yet still have not been able to find work.

But Mr. Speaker, the inability to find work is hardly due to a lack of trying. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, there are approximately 1½ million fewer jobs today than there were in March of 2001. And roughly 1 million workers have used up their unemployment insurance without finding a new job—more than 15,000 in Connecticut alone.

That is why, with America experiencing the lowest job growth in 58 years, we should not only be extending unemployment insurance, but also giving the unemployed opportunities to purchase health insurance. And we should guarantee an additional 26 weeks of benefits for everyone—whether they have exhausted their previous benefits or not.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the least we can do. Too many families were left out in the cold this holiday season due to the Republican's refusal to address this issue and a president who only voiced his support for an extension of benefits well after Congress had left town. Mr. Speaker, this bill is not enough, but it is better than nothing, which until now is all this majority has supported.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 23, which will finally provide for a 5-month extension of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002.

I say "finally" because this legislation is long overdue. We all knew for months that on December 28th, in the middle of the holiday season, an estimated one million people out of work would be cut off from receiving unemployment benefits. Yet neither House Republicans nor the President took action to help suffering Americans provide for themselves or for their families.

Mr. Speaker, our economy continues to weaken. The latest figures show that unem-

ployment claims in my district, which includes part of Miami-Dade County, reached a record high of 80,554 during October 2002. In only one year, unemployment claims were up an overwhelming 30%.

The unemployment rate in Miami-Dade County, a major international trading and tourist hub of the Americas, has climbed to an outrageous 8.0%, considerably higher than the national average. In Broward County, which is also a part of my district, the unemployment rate has reached a national rate of 6.0%.

Last week alone, there were more than 13,000 new jobless applicants filing for unemployment benefits. It is no wonder that Americans are enraged. The House has waited until today, 11 days after the expiration, to provide benefits to jobless Americans.

When a building is on fire, does a fire rescue team wait 11 days to put the fire out? When a patient is seriously ill, does a hospital wait 11 days to attend to this patient? In a crisis situation, we act immediately. The House has waited too long, putting Americans in fear.

My district and the country are in an unemployment crisis. Everyday, more and more of my constituents join the hundreds of thousands of Americans in my colleagues' districts in the unemployment line.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we help displaced American workers today. It is terrible that we have waited so long to do so.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill before us today which will provide as much as 26 weeks of additional unemployment benefits to laid off workers across America in "high unemployment states" and will ensure that those workers who still had benefits remaining on the December 28 cutoff date will receive all of their 13 weeks.

The Unemployment Insurance Benefits Extension Act, much like the provisions in the American Worker Temporary Relief Act that I introduced yesterday, will allow approximately 800,000 Americans, including nearly 6,000 workers in my state of Kansas, to once again begin receiving benefits. Like my bill, it also allows workers who may in the months ahead exhaust their regular 26 weeks of State unemployment benefits to become eligible for up to 13 weeks of extended benefits.

Unfortunately, this bill does nothing for those in my state and other states who have exhausted their 13 week extension and do not live in a state meeting the definition of a "high unemployment state."

This legislation is an important step in helping our workers through these tough economic times. Many have suffered from the lingering effects of a recession and the economic impact of the September 11th attacks.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember, however, that this is short term aid. The best and most responsible approach Congress can take is to adopt policies designed to get our economy growing again. We can all agree that America's workers would rather earn a paycheck than receive an unemployment benefit.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and approve this new extension in order to avoid a disruption in benefits to our nation's unemployed workers.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, today, we are considering one of the most important legislative initiatives that we, as members of the House of Representatives, can enact this year the extension of unemployment benefits for the millions of this nation's workers who have lost

their jobs in the current economic downturn. I am pleased to join with the overwhelming majority of my colleagues in the House in approving this bill, which will extend unemployment benefits for the more than 800,000 American workers lost their benefits on December 28, 2002 for an additional 13 weeks.

As the economy has stagnated and the job growth that characterized the economic boom of the 1990s has dissipated, the American economy has lost nearly one and one-half million jobs. In November of last year, the national unemployment rate reached an eight-year high of 6 percent.

Mr. Speaker, last month, the Democratic staff of the House Government Reform Committee, completed a study of the current state of unemployment in Chicago, Illinois. The study verified what we who live in Chicago already know—that unemployment in the Chicago metropolitan area, at 6.3 percent, is higher than both the statewide and national average. The Committee's study illustrated that of the 377,000 unemployed workers identified by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in Illinois, the vast majority of those individuals—263,000—are in the Chicago metropolitan area.

Many of these workers have exhausted their basic unemployment benefits in their search for new employment and were relying on the extended benefits provided under the law that expired on December 28, 2002. Without the passage of this most critical legislation, more than 65,000 workers in the Chicago area would have lost an estimated \$236 million in unemployment benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Congress has adopted this extension of unemployment benefits, but much more needs to be done. Unemployment nationwide is higher now than it was when Congress first passed the extended unemployment benefits in March of last year; the economic and fiscal condition of the nation is weaker. We need a strong, sound and fiscally responsible economic stimulus package that will create real jobs to support real families and provide real permanent relief to laid off workers and states.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 23, legislation to extend Temporary Unemployment Benefits. Millions of American workers are in trouble today, including many of my constituents, and it is high time we did something about it.

Back in March 2002, Congress created the Temporary Emergency Unemployment Benefits Compensation (TEUC) program to provide 13 weeks of federally funded unemployment insurance to qualified workers who had exhausted their state unemployment benefits, and an additional 13 weeks to some in "high unemployment" states. The TEUC program was a great idea, but we underestimated the economic trouble that we were in. At that time, the unemployment rate in my home state of Texas was 5.6% and that quickly rose to 6.9% by June of 2002. By November 2002, the latest month for which the Texas Workforce Commission has data, the official unemployment rate still stood at 6.0%, meaning that over 640,000 Texas workers are out of work.

So, we can see that the problem is not over. The need for an unemployment compensation extension is still very urgent. However, the TEUC program expired, three days after Christmas, on December 28, 2002. Congress was fully aware of the unemployment problem

when we were here in November and December, but the House leadership would not agree to the Senate compromise legislation, which was partly the work of the Republican Whip in the Senate. So, it is with great relief that I have the opportunity to vote in favor of the Senate compromise today.

While I am relieved that we are delivering relief to the people that need it most—those who are out of work and are trying their best to find it—I do not believe that we are doing enough. The legislation before us today only restores TEUC benefits for those who lost their eligibility on or after December 28, 2002. I am an original cosponsor of the Rangel-Cardin alternative, H.R. 17, which would restore these unemployed workers' benefits while they continue to look for work. H.R. 17 should be under consideration today by the House of Representatives, but the Republican leadership has denied us the opportunity to even let it come to vote.

Now I agree that partisan conflicts over how much unemployment assistance to provide during one of the longest economic slowdowns in recent history should not prevent us from doing something, today. So I strongly urge my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to support this legislation and send it to the president so that some unemployed workers can get something soon. After that, I also urge all of my colleagues to look at what we have done today and compare that to H.R. 17. If you do that, I think you will realize how much more needs to be done. Let us pass S. 23 today, and pass more relief as soon as possible.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened that the first major action of Congress will begin with a flawed process. One can only hope that this is not a sign of things to come with the Republican leadership at the helm of both chambers. Over 20,000 workers in Oregon alone were affected by the failure of Congress to pass this extension last session. These people deserve our best, not the lowest common denominator of benefits that the Republican leadership has decided it has to offer. Furthermore, the Republican leadership is not even allowing debate to occur on more reasonable options, instead choosing to limit the democratic process. The Democratic alternative provides for 26 weeks of extended unemployment benefits, helping nearly 2.5 million Americans over the next six months, while the Republican proposal only offers 13 weeks. While I am grateful for my jobless constituents that an extension will now be implemented, it is too little and too late.

Extending unemployment insurance is the fastest way to help the people that need it most, since it provides targeted and effective economic stimulus. These critical benefits increase consumer spending in the hardest-hit areas and sustain and strengthen economic recovery. It makes more sense to invest in expanded unemployment benefits now to help millions of Americans, than exploding the budget deficit with President Bush's economic stimulus plan which will cost almost \$850 billion, including debt service, and whose own economists say will create less than 200,000 jobs.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the measure passed by the Senate yesterday that would provide an extension of federal unemployment insurance benefits to jobless workers.

I am pleased that Congress is finally extending unemployment benefits to the 800,000 Americans and 2,800 Rhode Islanders whose federal benefits were cut off on December 28, 2002. However, I would be remiss if I did not remind the House Republican Leadership that even with passage of this legislation, Congress would still leave out over 1 million workers nationwide, including thousands of Rhode Islanders, who have already exhausted their benefits and are still unable to find a job.

Many Rhode Islanders, and Americans across the nation, are still struggling to find employment. The national unemployment rate reached 6 percent in November last year, its highest point in eight years, and Rhode Island's unemployment rate currently stands above 5 percent. Congress must provide all unemployed workers the resources they need to put food on the table and pay the bills while they weather this economic downturn.

While I intend to support the underlying legislation, I would point out that passage of this bill, as important as it is, will leave too many people without any means of support, and I would strongly urge my colleagues to turn their attention to the unemployed workers who have already exhausted their extended benefits. In addition, I am very disappointed that the Republican Leadership has denied our colleagues the opportunity to debate and vote on a Democratic alternative, which would provide 26 weeks of additional benefits to struggling workers. We must not turn our backs on those who are most vulnerable during these trying times.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, the House is finally acting to provide relief to some of the unemployed. This bill will be retroactive to December 28th, so those who had their benefits cut off will receive the remainder of the 13 weeks of benefits that is due to them. The relief will continue until June. It will also allow those who begin to receive their benefits to receive the full 13 weeks in the event that they are unable to find a job. That is good. However, this bill is not complete. This legislation fails to provide benefits to those who have already exhausted their benefits and are still unable to find a job. Why is the leadership forgetting those that need the benefits the most?

In Wisconsin, 22,200 people exhausted their unemployment benefits and remained unemployed at the end of December. This bill leaves these people and their families without help. Over one million people across our country have absolutely no recourse and have no assistance whatsoever because their benefits have expired. We are leaving them out in the cold when they need help the most.

These unemployment benefits don't just help the unemployed; they also help our economy as recipients will pay for immediate needs such as housing, utilities and food. Economists have said that every dollar spent on unemployment generates \$2.15 in economic stimulus. Offering assistance to those whose benefits have already expired would help these families and our economy. They are paying for basic necessities with their benefits. They are trying to keep their heads above water. Unfortunately, this bill is offering to help some of the unemployed, but not the thousands of Wisconsin families who have been without a paycheck for ten months or more.

I am glad we are providing the relief included in this bill, but we have to do more. We

must help those who continue to look for work in our weak economy. And we should do it today.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, there has been talk in recent months that if there is to be an economic recovery in our future, it will be a so-called "jobless recovery". I would submit that for the 8.5 million Americans who are currently unemployed, an economic recovery that does not provide jobs is no recovery at all.

The Economic Policy (EPI) has reported that using even optimistic projections of GDP growth, the unemployment rate is expected to remain at 6 percent for all of 2003. An analysis projecting less optimistic growth numbers suggest the unemployment rate will climb to 6.4 percent by the last quarter of this year. However, there is one factor that impacts the severity of the current downturn for American workers more than any other. That is, significantly more workers have exhausted their federal benefits since the federal extension of benefit program began in March than ran out of federal benefits over a comparable number of months in the recession of the early nineties.

Under the federal extension program of the early 90s, each worker was eligible for 20 to 26 weeks of benefits some ten months after the program was enacted. Under the program which just expired at the end of last December, most workers were eligible for a maximum of 13 weeks of benefits. As a result, by the end of December, an estimated 2.2 million workers had exhausted all of their federal benefits. And without Congressional assistance, the New Year brings these 2.2 million unemployed a job market that is stripped bare. It is a job market with 1.5 million fewer jobs today than in March of 2001.

For this reason it is critical that the federal unemployment insurance system be extended now. However, the Republican plan, and Democratic proposal which was disallowed, offer two very different levels of compensation to American families.

The Republican plan would provide 13 weeks of extended benefits over the next five months to the estimated 90,000 workers a week who will exhaust their state benefits without finding work. The Democratic plan would have offered 26 weeks. The Republican plan will also provide the remainder of 13 weeks of benefits to the nearly 800,000 workers who were cut off from federal unemployment benefits on December 28th when the program was allowed to expire. The Democratic plan offered workers those 13 weeks and adds 13 more for a total of 26 weeks.

In an even starker comparison, even in the face of economic data suggesting the current economic conditions are no better, and maybe even worse than when the current program began in March, The Republican proposal mysteriously provides no extension of benefits to the 1 million workers who exhausted their federal benefits by December and remain jobless.

The Democratic proposal gave those workers an extra 13 weeks of job-hunting cushioned by unemployment insurance. Indeed, the Democratic plan did not selectively pick and choose which group of unemployed workers it deemed worthy of coverage. For in a so-called "jobless recovery" millions of Americans will remain jobless. But under the Republican's so-called unemployment plan, 1 million

Americans will also be without unemployment insurance.

In covering these 1 million Americans, the Democratic proposal did not ignore the over \$24 million sitting unused in the Federal Unemployment Trust Fund. Instead it honors the basic purpose of the trust funds: to build large resources when work is plentiful in order to provide relief to the unemployed when they need it most. The Republican proposal "writes off" 1 million people. Contrary to the thinking behind the Republican proposal, there is no reason 1 million unemployed workers should be denied unemployment compensation when they need it the most. The Democratic plan suggest the time for them to receive it is now. So do I. Vote for the Motion to Recommit.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, each day Americans are losing their jobs across the country and in all sectors of the economy. My state of Texas and city of Houston have suffered job losses. I have heard from many constituents whose have been laid off and from those whose unemployment benefits expired shortly after Christmas on December 28.

The Republican plan passed by the Senate yesterday does not go far enough. The Republican plan does not help those workers who have already exhausted their benefits. I am appalled. I support the Democratic alternative plan offered by Congressman CHARLES RANGEL.

The Rangel/Cardin bill would extend unemployment insurance benefits an additional 13 weeks to those in need. The Republican plan does not; these workers would not receive any additional assistance. About one million workers have exhausted their 13 weeks of extended benefits under the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation (TEUC) program and still remain unemployed.

Every week about 90,000 workers run out of regular, state provided unemployment benefits before finding a job. During the last recession, Congress initially provided these workers with 26 weeks of extended benefits. The Democratic plan would provide these workers with at least 26 weeks of extended benefits, which would help nearly 2.5 million Americans over the next six months. The Republican plan would generally provide 13 weeks of extended benefits over the next five months (only three states currently qualify under a trigger to provide 26 weeks).

The Republican proposal would allow these workers to receive the remainder of their initial 13 weeks of extended benefits (not clear if benefits are retroactive). The Democratic bill would provide these workers with the remainder of their first 13 weeks (retroactively), and an additional 13 weeks, for a total 26 weeks of extended benefits.

We need to help those people whose unemployment benefits expired on December 28. I have heard from many of my constituents in the 18th Congressional District in Houston who have exhausted their unemployment benefits. I agree with one of my constituents who said that we should "Leave no jobless worker behind."

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation to reinstate the extended unemployment benefits program. These are bad economic times we are living in and few places have it tougher than my home state of Washington which had a 6.6 percent unemployment rate in November. I

know from my constituents that these extra weeks of benefits are a vital lifeline which I wish we had extended back in December. While I am relieved that we finally are passing this bill, I wish that we had the chance to vote on an unemployment package that more fully meets the needs of those Americans who are out of work.

While I am grateful that this bill contains a provision that provides an additional 13 weeks of extended benefits for states with exceptionally high jobless rates—which includes Washington State and two others—it is a mistake that the eligibility requirements are so stringent that the jobless in 47 states cannot receive them. These additional benefits will result in 26 weeks of extended benefits for those of my constituents who have been unable to find new employment. But I do not understand why those unfortunate people living in other states who find themselves in a similar dire situation are limited to only 13 weeks of extended benefits because the unemployment rate is lower in their home state. Being out of work is devastating for people and their families wherever they live and Congress should pass a bill reflecting that reality.

The extended benefits authorized by this legislation expire at the end of May. It is doubtful that the economy will have improved significantly by then. Therefore, we will need to re-visit this issue before these benefits expire. I hope at that time we will pass legislation that better meets the tremendous needs of those Americans who are having a hard time finding new jobs. Compassion demands that action.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I don't have to lecture my colleagues on the difficult economic problems facing the country, state and local governments, and far too many of our constituents who have lost jobs or are losing benefits and support services due to budget pressures. We're all much too familiar with those facts.

But, I was elected to be a voice for those who need help. And, Mr. Speaker, there are 18,000 Oregonians who need help and this bill isn't going to provide it. I'm grateful that this bill will provide extended benefits for some 20,000 unemployed Oregonians who were at some stage of the Temporary Emergency Unemployment Compensation (TEUC) program that expired on December 28, 2002, and the 35,000 Oregonians that are expected to lose work between now and the end of May when this extension expires. However, the bill turns a cold shoulder on the 18,000 long-term unemployed Oregonians who have already exhausted 26 weeks of TEUC.

The unemployment rate in Oregon has hovered between 7 and 8 percent for more than a year. Several counties have double digit unemployment rates, and new layoff are announced weekly. The workers of the Pacific Northwest need help. And we should give it to them.

The Congressional Budget Office projects the national unemployment rate will remain at about six percent until the second half of 2003. The Oregon rate is expected to be higher than the national average.

Unemployment insurance provides targeted and effective economic stimulus. These critical benefits increase consumer spending in the hardest hit areas and sustain and strengthen economic recovery. Fortunately, the federal unemployment insurance trust funds contain

large reserves that can be used to strengthen TEUC without additional unemployment insurance taxes.

I sat here today and listened to the debate on this legislation and heard member after member on the other side of the aisle say how important this legislation is and how much workers need this assistance, but we just can't afford to provide additional benefits for the long-term unemployed. That's not true, and it's unconscionable that we're not providing additional benefits for those who, through no fault of their own, have found themselves on the wrong side of this "economic recovery," and haven't been able to find work.

Somehow, we could afford to give members of Congress a generous 3.4 percent cost-of-living adjustment, but could only give senior citizens a paltry 1.4 percent increase. Somehow, there was money to throw all sorts of favors to corporate special interests at the end of the session, and there's money for more tax breaks for those earning more than \$373,000 a year. Somehow, there was money to give President Bush's political appointee's bonuses at the end of the year, but we can't use the huge surpluses in the unemployment trust funds to give a hand to the 800,000 long-term unemployed who are trying to hang on to their homes, pay the heating bill, keep food on the table, and keep their families together. There's something very wrong with the priorities here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 14, the Senate bill is considered as read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO COMMIT OFFERED BY MR. McDERMOTT

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. McDERMOTT. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The clerk read as follows:

Mr. McDERMOTT moves to commit the bill S. 23 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions that the Committee report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2003".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Extension of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002.
- Sec. 3. Entitlement to additional weeks of temporary extended unemployment compensation.
- Sec. 4. Application of revised rate of insured unemployment.
- Sec. 5. Additional TEUC extended benefit period trigger.

Sec. 6. Additional weeks of benefits for workers in high unemployment States.

Sec. 7. Effective date.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2002.

(a) SIX-MONTH EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—Section 208 of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 30) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 208. APPLICABILITY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), an agreement entered into under this title shall apply to weeks of unemployment—

“(1) beginning after the date on which such agreement is entered into; and

“(2) ending before July 1, 2003.

“(b) TRANSITION.—In the case of an individual who is receiving temporary extended unemployment compensation for the week which immediately precedes July 1, 2003, temporary extended unemployment compensation shall continue to be payable to such individual for any week thereafter from the account from which such individual received compensation for the week immediately preceding that termination date. No compensation shall be payable by reason of the preceding sentence for any week beginning after December 31, 2003.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21).

SEC. 3. ENTITLEMENT TO ADDITIONAL WEEKS OF TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

Paragraph (1) of section 203(b) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount established in an account under subsection (a) shall be equal to 26 times the individual's weekly benefit amount for the benefit year.”.

SEC. 4. APPLICATION OF REVISED RATE OF INSURED UNEMPLOYMENT.

Section 207 of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended—

(1) by striking “In” and inserting “(a) GENERAL DEFINITIONS.—In”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(b) ADJUSTED INSURED UNEMPLOYMENT RATE.—For purposes of carrying out section 203(c) with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2003, the term ‘rate of insured unemployment’, as used in section 203(d) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note), has the meaning given such term under section 203(e)(1) of such Act, except that individuals exhausting their right to regular compensation during the most recent 3 calendar months for which data are available before the close of the period for which such rate is being determined shall be taken into account as if they were individuals filing claims for regular compensation for each week during the period for which such rate is being determined.”.

SEC. 5. ADDITIONAL TEUC EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD TRIGGER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 203(c) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) ADDITIONAL EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD TRIGGER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective with respect to compensation for weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2003, an agreement under this title shall provide that, in addition to any other extended benefit period trigger, for purposes of beginning or ending any extended benefit period under this section—

“(i) there is a State ‘on’ indicator for a week if—

“(I) the average rate of total unemployment in such State (seasonally adjusted) for the period consisting of the most recent 3 months for which data for all States are published before the close of such week equals or exceeds 6 percent; and

“(II) the average rate of total unemployment in such State (seasonally adjusted) for the 3-month period referred to in clause (i) equals or exceeds 110 percent of such average rate for either (or both) of the corresponding 3-month periods ending in the 2 preceding calendar years; and

“(ii) there is a State ‘off’ indicator for a week if either the requirements of subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i) are not satisfied.

“(B) NO EFFECT ON OTHER DETERMINATIONS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of any agreement described in subparagraph (A), any week for which there would otherwise be a State ‘on’ indicator shall continue to be such a week and shall not be determined to be a week for which there is a State ‘off’ indicator.

“(C) DETERMINATIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY.—For purposes of this subsection, determinations of the rate of total unemployment in any State for any period (and of any seasonal adjustment) shall be made by the Secretary.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 203(c)(1) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended by inserting “or (3)” after “paragraph (2)”.

SEC. 6. ADDITIONAL WEEKS OF BENEFITS FOR WORKERS IN HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT STATES.

Section 203(c)(1) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 30) is amended by striking “an amount equal to the amount originally established in such account (as determined under subsection (b)(1))” and inserting “7 times the individual's weekly benefit amount for the benefit year”.

SEC. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment this Act.

(b) RESUMPTION OF BENEFITS.—

(1) RULE APPLICABLE TO EXHAUSTEES.—In the case of any individual—

(A) to whom any temporary extended unemployment compensation was payable for any week beginning before January 1, 2003, and

(B) who exhausted such individual's rights to such compensation (by reason of the payment of all amounts in such individual's temporary extended unemployment compensation account) before January 1, 2003,

such individual's eligibility for any additional weeks of temporary extended unemployment compensation by reason of the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) RULE APPLICABLE TO NON-EXHAUSTEES.—In the case of any individual—

(A) to whom any temporary extended unemployment compensation was payable for

any week beginning before January 1, 2003, and

(B) as to whom the condition described in paragraph (1)(B) does not apply,

such individual shall, upon appropriate application, be eligible for temporary extended unemployment compensation (in accordance with the provisions of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, as amended by this Act) with respect to any weeks of unemployment beginning on or after December 29, 2002.

(c) DATE FOR DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY OF EXHAUSTEES FOR AUGMENTED BENEFITS.—In the case of any individual described in subsection (b)(1), the determination under section 203(c) as to whether such individual's State is in an extended benefit period (for purposes of determining eligibility for augmented benefits under the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, as amended by this Act) shall be made—

(1) as of the date of enactment of this Act, and

(2) without regard to whether or not such a determination was made under the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, as in effect before the amendments made by this Act.

Mr. McDERMOTT (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to commit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to considering the motion as having been read, but I object to the motion to commit on the basis of its violation of the Budget Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman make a point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I object and make the point of order because this motion, if passed, would cause the allocation to the Committee on Ways and Means to be further exceeded in the first year and over the 5-year period governed by the budget resolution currently deemed in force. The motion therefore violates section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act, and I make a point of order that it violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there any other Member who wishes to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, if I understand the objection, it is based upon the fact that, as I understand it, the bill before us has a waiver on the Budget Act from the Committee on Rules, but that because there is no waiver of the Budget Act provided in the rules, the minority will not have a chance to offer a similar type of a motion to recommit.

I would ask the chairman, is that the basis that we were not protected in the rule, whereas the underlying bill did not get a waiver in the rule?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman that that is the

technical effect. However, had the minority offered an amendment which was in the—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman suspend? Members will not engage in colloquy on a point of order. The Chair will hear argument on the point of order from each Member in turn.

Mr. THOMAS. Might I make an argument on the point of order, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) may complete his argument first.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, may I yield on my reservation or argument?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is no yielding on a point of order.

Mr. CARDIN. Let me just complete my argument, and then I would welcome the chairman's response.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there needs to be some discretion here as far as fairness in the rules. I know that yesterday we adopted the rules of the House. It seems to me that the minority needs to be protected to be able to offer a motion to recommit.

I understand the chairman's point, but it would seem to me that the rules should permit the minority to offer a motion to recommit if we are going to have an open and full debate in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Are there other Members who wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Further on my point of order, Mr. Speaker, the reason I believe a 302(f) budget point of order lies against this measure is that it significantly exceeds in its amount the underlying bill.

The legislation before us was not reported by any committee of the House; rather, it was passed by the Senate, and the Committee on Rules has presented it to us.

So my point of order is not based on the fact that the underlying measure has a waiver from the Committee on Rules; it is that if the minority had offered an amendment equal to or less than the Senate position, it would have been in order and not subject to a point of order. Since it is significantly in excess of the Senate measure, it does in fact violate 302(f) of the Budget Act.

□ 1300

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Are there other Members who wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) makes a point of order that the amendment proposed by the instructions in the motion to commit offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) violates section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Section 302(f) of the Budget Act precludes consideration of an amendment providing new budget authority if the adoption of the amendment and enactment of the bill, as amended, would cause the pertinent allocation of new budget authority under section 302(a) of the act to be exceeded.

The Chair is persuasively guided by an estimate of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) that an amendment providing any net increase in new budget authority for fiscal year 2003, or the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2007, over that provided by the bill would exacerbate the breach of the applicable section 302(a) allocations of the Committee on Ways and Means.

As such, the motion to commit violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act. The point of order is sustained, and the motion is not in order.

MOTION TO COMMIT OFFERED BY MR.
McDERMOTT

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. McDERMOTT. Yes, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to commit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McDERMOTT moves to commit the bill S. 23 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions that the Committee report the same back to the House promptly with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2003".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Extension of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002.
- Sec. 3. Entitlement to additional weeks of temporary extended unemployment compensation.
- Sec. 4. Application of revised rate of insured unemployment.
- Sec. 5. Additional TEUC extended benefit period trigger.
- Sec. 6. Additional weeks of benefits for workers in high unemployment States.
- Sec. 7. Effective date.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2002.

(a) SIX-MONTH EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—Section 208 of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 30) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 208. APPLICABILITY.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), an agreement entered into under this title shall apply to weeks of unemployment—

- "(1) beginning after the date on which such agreement is entered into; and
- "(2) ending before July 1, 2003.

"(b) TRANSITION.—In the case of an individual who is receiving temporary extended unemployment compensation for the week which immediately precedes July 1, 2003, temporary extended unemployment com-

pensation shall continue to be payable to such individual for any week thereafter from the account from which such individual received compensation for the week immediately preceding that termination date. No compensation shall be payable by reason of the preceding sentence for any week beginning after December 31, 2003."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21).

SEC. 3. ENTITLEMENT TO ADDITIONAL WEEKS OF TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

Paragraph (1) of section 203(b) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount established in an account under subsection (a) shall be equal to 26 times the individual's weekly benefit amount for the benefit year."

SEC. 4. APPLICATION OF REVISED RATE OF INSURED UNEMPLOYMENT.

Section 207 of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended—

(1) by striking "In" and inserting "(a) GENERAL DEFINITIONS.—In"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(b) ADJUSTED INSURED UNEMPLOYMENT RATE.—For purposes of carrying out section 203(c) with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2003, the term 'rate of insured unemployment', as used in section 203(d) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note), has the meaning given such term under section 203(e)(1) of such Act, except that individuals exhausting their right to regular compensation during the most recent 3 calendar months for which data are available before the close of the period for which such rate is being determined shall be taken into account as if they were individuals filing claims for regular compensation for each week during the period for which such rate is being determined."

SEC. 5. ADDITIONAL TEUC EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD TRIGGER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 203(c) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) ADDITIONAL EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD TRIGGER.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective with respect to compensation for weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2003, an agreement under this title shall provide that, in addition to any other extended benefit period trigger, for purposes of beginning or ending any extended benefit period under this section—

"(i) there is a State 'on' indicator for a week if—

- "(I) the average rate of total unemployment in such State (seasonally adjusted) for the period consisting of the most recent 3 months for which data for all States are published before the close of such week equals or exceeds 6 percent; and
- "(II) the average rate of total unemployment in such State (seasonally adjusted) for the 3-month period referred to in clause (i) equals or exceeds 110 percent of such average rate for either (or both) of the corresponding 3-month periods ending in the 2 preceding calendar years; and

"(ii) there is a State 'off' indicator for a week if either the requirements of subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i) are not satisfied.

“(B) NO EFFECT ON OTHER DETERMINATIONS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of any agreement described in subparagraph (A), any week for which there would otherwise be a State ‘on’ indicator shall continue to be such a week and shall not be determined to be a week for which there is a State ‘off’ indicator.

“(C) DETERMINATIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY.—For purposes of this subsection, determinations of the rate of total unemployment in any State for any period (and of any seasonal adjustment) shall be made by the Secretary.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 203(c)(1) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended by inserting “or (3)” after “paragraph (2)”.

SEC. 6. ADDITIONAL WEEKS OF BENEFITS FOR WORKERS IN HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT STATES.

Section 203(c)(1) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 30) is amended by striking “an amount equal to the amount originally established in such account (as determined under subsection (b)(1))” and inserting “7 times the individual’s weekly benefit amount for the benefit year”.

SEC. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) RESUMPTION OF BENEFITS.—

(1) RULE APPLICABLE TO EXHAUSTEES.—In the case of any individual—

(A) to whom any temporary extended unemployment compensation was payable for any week beginning before January 1, 2003, and

(B) who exhausted such individual’s rights to such compensation (by reason of the payment of all amounts in such individual’s temporary extended unemployment compensation account) before January 1, 2003, such individual’s eligibility for any additional weeks of temporary extended unemployment compensation by reason of the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) RULE APPLICABLE TO NON-EXHAUSTEES.—In the case of any individual—

(A) to whom any temporary extended unemployment compensation was payable for any week beginning before January 1, 2003, and

(B) as to whom the condition described in paragraph (1)(B) does not apply, such individual shall, upon appropriate application, be eligible for temporary extended unemployment compensation (in accordance with the provisions of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, as amended by this Act) with respect to any weeks of unemployment beginning on or after December 29, 2002.

(c) DATE FOR DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY OF EXHAUSTEES FOR AUGMENTED BENEFITS.—In the case of any individual described in subsection (b)(1), the determination under section 203(c) as to whether such individual’s State is in an extended benefit period (for purposes of determining eligibility for augmented benefits under the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, as amended by this Act) shall be made—

(1) as of the date of enactment of this Act, and

(2) without regard to whether or not such a determination was made under the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation

Act of 2002, as in effect before the amendments made by this Act.

Mr. THOMAS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD since the appropriate part has already been read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we need to pass legislation today, so I support legislation. I think it is important that we deal with the people who lost their benefits in December because we failed to extend the law. I think it is important that we pass legislation that will provide the additional weeks of benefits for those who exhaust their regular unemployment insurance, and the underlying legislation does that and it is worthy of support.

The problem is, as we have heard during the course of this debate, that the legislation does not go far enough. There will be a million people during the next several months who will exhaust their extended benefits, and the gentleman’s motion to commit urges us to deal with that group of unemployed who have lost their unemployment insurance benefits through no fault of their own; and if we do not take action immediately, these individuals will not have any unemployment insurance benefits.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the motion before us will not delay the issue. I know I will hear that from my friends. The conference could be appointed today. It could act today. This is not a controversial issue. This is unfinished business from the last Congress. The funds are there. The funds are in the Federal unemployment trust account to pay for these benefits.

In 1990, the last recession we had, we extended benefits for 26 additional weeks. This tells us to do at least as well for the unemployed today as we did in the 1990s so we can get this done. We can get it done quickly, and we can get it done before we adjourn this week, and that is the essence of the gentleman’s motion. So I support the underlying bill, but we need to do better now on the unfinished business of the last Congress.

Then, Mr. Speaker, let me urge my chairman who is on the floor that we look at reforming the unemployment insurance and we do it quickly, that we deal with the part-time employees who pay into the unemployment insurance funds and do not get unemployment benefits. And we deal with the people, many of whom left the welfare system for work only to find that their jobs

have been lost and we deal with the most recent quarter of their earnings so they can qualify for unemployment insurance. As we look at a stimulus package, let us also look at increasing the benefits for those people who are unemployed. That would certainly stimulate our economy and is far less costly than the tax legislation that the President brought forward yesterday.

So I would urge my colleagues to support the gentleman from Washington’s motion to commit. It urges us to do more. It allows us to move forward with the underlying bill but to do more; and we can get it done today, make no mistake about it. The conference report could be back to us before we leave this evening. There is no question about that in anyone’s mind. We know exactly what needs to be done, and I would urge my colleagues to support the motion to commit.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that you have a calendar which says we will be here until 8 or 9 o’clock tonight, so there is plenty of time to make this small change, and any argument that we do not have time is simply a bogus argument.

Now, the fact is that as my colleague from Maryland has said, this is unfinished business from before. I have tried two different ways and the majority is intent on killing any attempt to modify what they have agreed to with the Senate. Now, I guess from now on we will just wait for the Senate to tell us what we need to do because the House clearly has no power to ever confront the Senate and tell the Senate that they have made not quite the right bill.

This is a historic moment. I do not ever remember being in the House of Representatives any place where they conceded to the Senate that whatever the Senate says is what we have to do.

We could do this by 3 o’clock very easily and cover a million people. Now, for anybody to say that because they have already exhausted, because of that technicality on the 28th of December they should not get any more, I find that incredible that you would say that to somebody who is unemployed, that the law we wrote did not work so you do not get any money. Explain that to your kids when you are sitting there at the dinner table. We do not have any food, kids, because the law that the Congress wrote did not work right so I did not get a check this month. I paid for it, I paid into the benefits, and we do not get them.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, apparently we have come full circle. I opened this debate

by saying I had the uncomfortable requirement of informing the House and hoped that it would be the last time that we did so, that I was presenting a bill passed by the Senate and that we would be compelled to have to pass the bill that was passed by the Senate.

I did mention at that time that the Senate passed it unanimously. Notwithstanding the difficulties the other body has in coming together to pass legislation, when time is up, they were able to come together and agree that we needed to address a problem, and they passed this legislation.

For my friends on the other side of the aisle to offer this motion to commit versus the previous one, and the reason I said you did not need to read any further is all you have to do is look at the first paragraph that said the House should report it forthwith. That, in fact, means it comes immediately back and it could go to the Senate. They changed the word "forthwith" to "promptly." That means it has to go to committee. And for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, members of the Committee on Ways and Means say all we have to do is get the Committee on Ways and Means together so we can go ahead and hold a meeting, I have to tell you, who are your appointees to the Committee on Ways and Means?

The Committee on Ways and Means has not been constituted. We do not have a functioning committee. And yet they say blithely all we have to do is come together.

I cannot imagine the mental set that says notwithstanding the Senate came together in time of need and worked cooperatively that even at 11:30 to midnight my friends on the other side of the aisle are offering motions to commit which will kill this provision.

This provision allows for those December 28 folks to continue their benefits. In fact, it allows for almost 4 million to continue to receive benefits, an additional 2 million under the time extension, for a total of 6 million Americans to receive their unemployment benefits. If the motion to commit passes, it effectively kills the measure. The Senate's attempt to unify and put politics aside will have been destroyed by my colleagues' willingness to even today play politics.

In December, the House passed a short-term extension, only 5 weeks. We were criticized for making it only 5 weeks. Why? Because we wanted to address the question when we came back.

My friend from Maryland says we ought to address this promptly. You voted against the measure that would have required us to address it promptly. The Senate failed to pass it. So we are in a position of having the President sign a bill tomorrow or not sign a bill tomorrow.

If you vote "yes" for the motion to commit, there will be no bill signed tomorrow and people will really lose the unemployment benefits that they have earned, those people that you appar-

ently shed crocodile tears over. If you vote against the motion to commit and for passage of the measure, we will pick up those folks who inadvertently were dropped on December 28; and 6 million people will continue to receive benefits and hopefully we will pass legislation which will in fact spur the economy and provide them with a job instead of unemployment insurance. And I am quite sure my colleagues will be opposed to the proposals to stimulate the economy as well. So those will be future battles.

Today the line is drawn very simply. Vote for the motion to commit and kill the opportunity to help people get their well-deserved unemployment. Vote against the motion to commit, vote for the underlying bill, and the President can have a bill-signing ceremony tomorrow, and we can do what we should have done back in December.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to commit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to commit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote, if ordered, on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 202, nays 224, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—202

Abercrombie	Davis (AL)	Hinojosa
Ackerman	Davis (CA)	Hoeffel
Alexander	Davis (FL)	Holden
Allen	Davis (IL)	Holt
Andrews	Davis (TN)	Honda
Baca	DeFazio	Houghton
Baird	DeGette	Hoyer
Baldwin	Delahunt	Inslee
Ballance	DeLauro	Israel
Becerra	Deutsch	Jackson (IL)
Bell	Dicks	Jackson-Lee
Berkley	Dingell	(TX)
Berman	Doggett	Jefferson
Berry	Dooley (CA)	John
Bishop (GA)	Doyle	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (NY)	Edwards	Jones (OH)
Blumenauer	Emanuel	Kanjorski
Boswell	Engel	Kaptur
Boucher	Eshoo	Kennedy (RI)
Boyd	Etheridge	Kildee
Brady (PA)	Evans	Kleczka
Brown (OH)	Farr	Kucinich
Brown, Corrine	Fattah	Lampson
Capps	Filner	Langevin
Capuano	Ford	Lantos
Cardin	Frank (MA)	Larsen (WA)
Cardoza	Frost	Larson (CT)
Carson (IN)	Gephardt	Lee
Carson (OK)	Gonzalez	Levin
Case	Gordon	Lewis (GA)
Clay	Green (TX)	Lipinski
Clyburn	Grijalva	Lofgren
Conyers	Gutierrez	Lowey
Cooper	Hall	Lucas (KY)
Costello	Harman	Lynch
Cramer	Hastings (FL)	Majette
Crowley	Hill	Maloney
Cummings	Hinchey	Markey

Marshall	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Matheson	Pascarell	Snyder
Matsui	Pastor	Solis
McCarthy (MO)	Payne	Spratt
McCarthy (NY)	Pelosi	Stark
McCollum	Peterson (MN)	Stenholm
McDermott	Pomeroy	Strickland
McGovern	Price (NC)	Stupak
McIntyre	Rahall	Tanner
McNulty	Rangel	Tauscher
Meehan	Reyes	Taylor (MS)
Meek (FL)	Rodriguez	Thompson (CA)
Meeks (NY)	Ross	Thompson (MS)
Menendez	Rothman	Tierney
Michaud	Roybal-Allard	Turner (TX)
Millender	Ruppersberger	Udall (CO)
McDonald	Rush	Udall (NM)
Miller (NC)	Ryan (OH)	Van Hollen
Miller, George	Sabo	Velazquez
Mollohan	Sanchez, Linda	Visclosky
Moore	T.	Waters
Moran (VA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Watson
Murtha	Sanders	Watt
Nadler	Sandlin	Waxman
Napolitano	Schakowsky	Weiner
Neal (MA)	Schiff	Wexler
Oberstar	Scott (GA)	Woolsey
Obey	Scott (VA)	Wu
Oliver	Serrano	Wynn
Ortiz	Sherman	
Owens	Slaughter	

NAYS—224

Aderholt	Ferguson	McCotter
Akin	Flake	McCrery
Bachus	Fletcher	McHugh
Baker	Foley	McInnis
Ballenger	Forbes	McKeon
Barrett (SC)	Fossella	Mica
Bartlett (MD)	Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)
Barton (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)
Bass	Gallegly	Miller, Gary
Beauprez	Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)
Bereuter	Gerlach	Murphy
Biggert	Gibbons	Musgrave
Billirakis	Gilchrest	Myrick
Bishop (UT)	Gillmor	Ney
Blackburn	Gingrey	Northup
Blunt	Goode	Norwood
Boehlert	Goodlatte	Nunes
Boehner	Goss	Nussle
Bonilla	Granger	Osborne
Bonner	Graves	Ose
Bono	Green (WI)	Otter
Boozman	Greenwood	Oxley
Bradley (NH)	Gutknecht	Paul
Brady (TX)	Harris	Pearce
Brown (SC)	Hart	Pence
Brown-Waite,	Hastings (WA)	Peterson (PA)
Ginny	Hayes	Petri
Burgess	Hayworth	Pickering
Burns	Hefley	Pitts
Burr	Hensarling	Platts
Buyer	Herger	Pombo
Calvert	Hobson	Porter
Camp	Hoekstra	Portman
Cannon	Hostettler	Pryce (OH)
Cantor	Hulshof	Putnam
Capito	Hunter	Quinn
Carter	Hyde	Radanovich
Castle	Isakson	Ramstad
Chabot	Issa	Regula
Chocola	Istook	Rehberg
Coble	Janklow	Renzi
Cole	Jenkins	Reynolds
Collins	Johnson (CT)	Rogers (AL)
Combest	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Cox	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Crane	Jones (NC)	Rohrabacher
Crenshaw	Keller	Ros-Lehtinen
Cubin	Kelly	Royce
Culberson	Kennedy (MN)	Ryan (WI)
Cunningham	King (IA)	Ryun (KS)
Davis, Jo Ann	King (NY)	Saxton
Davis, Tom	Kingston	Schrock
Deal (GA)	Kirk	Sensenbrenner
DeLay	Kline	Sessions
DeMint	Knollenberg	Shadegg
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kolbe	Shaw
Diaz-Balart, M.	LaHood	Shays
Doolittle	Latham	Sherwood
Dreier	LaTourette	Shimkus
Duncan	Leach	Shuster
Dunn	Lewis (CA)	Simmons
Ehlers	Lewis (KY)	Simpson
Emerson	Linder	Skelton
English	LoBiondo	Smith (MI)
Everett	Lucas (OK)	Smith (NJ)
Feeney	Manzullo	Smith (TX)

Souder	Thornberry	Weldon (FL)
Stearns	Tiahrt	Weldon (PA)
Sullivan	Tiberi	Weller
Sweeney	Toomey	Whitfield
Tancred	Turner (OH)	Wicker
Tauzin	Upton	Wilson (NM)
Taylor (NC)	Walden (OR)	Wilson (SC)
Terry	Walsh	Young (AK)
Thomas	Wamp	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Burton (IN)	Nethercutt	Wolf
Kilpatrick	Towns	
Kind	Vitter	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). The Chair advises Members that approximately 2 minutes remain in this 15-minute vote.

□ 1333

Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, CRAMER, SMITH of Washington, CARSON of Oklahoma, GORDON, and HALL changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Messrs. JOHNSON of Illinois, BOEHLERT, and OXLEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 6 I inadvertently pressed the “yea” button. I meant to vote “nay” on the McDermott motion to commit.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has a statement about the length of electronic votes.

Clause 4 of rule XX says that Members shall have at least 15 minutes to respond on an ordinary record vote or quorum call. But with cooperation among the Members, it is possible to complete a vote in that time.

The Chair believes that closing votes as soon as possible after the guaranteed minimum time should be the regular practice. The Chair is certain that votes can be shortened if Members simply resolve to head to the Chamber as soon as they are notified by the bell-and-light signal. The Chair will remind Members when 2 minutes remain on the clock.

The goal of completing votes in as close to the minimum time as possible is even more reasonable in the case of a 5-minute vote, because every 5-minute vote necessarily follows another electronic vote, and is always preceded by an announcement from the Chair and a distinctive bell-and-light signal.

No occupant of the chair would prevent a Member who is in the well of the Chamber before a result is announced from casting his or her vote. But each occupant of the chair will have the full support of the Speaker in striving to close each electronic vote at the earliest opportunity. Members should not rely on signals relayed from outside the Chamber to assume that votes will be held open until they arrive in the Chamber.

The question is on the passage of the Senate bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 4, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie	Cubin	Herger
Ackerman	Culberson	Hill
Aderholt	Cummings	Hinchey
Alexander	Cunningham	Hinojosa
Allen	Davis (AL)	Hobson
Andrews	Davis (CA)	Hoefel
Baca	Davis (FL)	Hoekstra
Baird	Davis (IL)	Holden
Baker	Davis (TN)	Holt
Baldwin	Davis, Jo Ann	Honda
Ballance	Davis, Tom	Hostettler
Ballenger	Deal (GA)	Houghton
Barrett (SC)	DeFazio	Hoyer
Bartlett (MD)	DeGette	Hulshof
Barton (TX)	DeLauro	Hunter
Bass	DeLay	Hyde
Beauprez	DeMint	Inslee
Becerra	Deutsch	Isakson
Bereuter	Diaz-Balart, L.	Israel
Berkley	Diaz-Balart, M.	Issa
Berman	Dicks	Istook
Berry	Dingell	Jackson (IL)
Biggart	Doggett	Jackson-Lee
Bilirakis	Dooley (CA)	(TX)
Bishop (GA)	Doolittle	Janklow
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Jefferson
Bishop (UT)	Dreier	Jenkins
Blackburn	Duncan	John
Blumenauer	Dunn	Johnson (CT)
Blunt	Edwards	Johnson (IL)
Boehlert	Ehlers	Johnson, E. B.
Boehner	Emanuel	Johnson, Sam
Bonilla	Emerson	Jones (NC)
Bonner	Engel	Jones (OH)
Bono	English	Kanjorski
Boozman	Eshoo	Kaptur
Boswell	Etheridge	Keller
Boucher	Evans	Kelly
Boyd	Everett	Kennedy (MN)
Bradley (NH)	Farr	Kennedy (RI)
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Kildee
Brady (TX)	Feeney	King (IA)
Brown (OH)	Ferguson	King (NY)
Brown (SC)	Filner	Kingston
Brown, Corrine	Fletcher	Kirk
Brown-Waite,	Foley	Kleccka
Ginny	Forbes	Kline
Burgess	Ford	Knollenberg
Burns	Fossella	Kolbe
Burr	Frank (MA)	Kucinich
Burton (IN)	Franks (AZ)	LaHood
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	Lampson
Calvert	Frost	Langevin
Camp	Gephardt	Lantos
Cannon	Gerlach	Larsen (WA)
Cantor	Gibbons	Latham
Capito	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Capps	Gillmor	Leach
Capuano	Gingrey	Lee
Cardin	Gonzalez	Levin
Cardoza	Goode	Lewis (CA)
Carson (IN)	Goodlatte	Lewis (GA)
Carson (OK)	Gordon	Lewis (KY)
Carter	Goss	Linder
Case	Granger	Lipinski
Castle	Graves	LoBiondo
Chabot	Green (TX)	Lofgren
Chocola	Green (WI)	Lowey
Clay	Greenwood	Lucas (KY)
Clyburn	Grijalva	Lucas (OK)
Coble	Gutierrez	Lynch
Cole	Gutknecht	Majette
Collins	Hall	Maloney
Combest	Harman	Manzullo
Conyers	Harris	Markey
Cooper	Hart	Marshall
Costello	Hastings (FL)	Matheson
Cox	Hastings (WA)	Matsui
Cramer	Hayes	McCarthy (MO)
Crane	Hayworth	McCarthy (NY)
Crenshaw	Hefley	McCollum
Crowley	Hensarling	McCotter

McCrery	Pomeroy	Smith (NJ)
McGovern	Porter	Smith (TX)
McHugh	Portman	Smith (WA)
McInnis	Price (NC)	Snyder
McIntyre	Pryce (OH)	Solis
McKeon	Putnam	Souder
McNulty	Quinn	Spratt
Meehan	Radanovich	Stark
Meek (FL)	Rahall	Stearns
Meeks (NY)	Ramstad	Stenholm
Menendez	Rangel	Strickland
Mica	Regula	Stupak
Michaud	Rehberg	Sullivan
Millender-	Renzi	Sweeney
McDonald	Reyes	Tancred
Miller (MI)	Reynolds	Tanner
Miller (NC)	Rodriguez	Tauscher
Miller, Gary	Rogers (AL)	Taylor (MS)
Miller, George	Rogers (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Mollohan	Rogers (MI)	Terry
Moore	Rohrabacher	Thomas
Moran (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (CA)
Moran (VA)	Ross	Thompson (MS)
Murphy	Rothman	Thornberry
Murtha	Roybal-Allard	Tiahrt
Musgrave	Royce	Tiberi
Myrick	Ruppersberger	Tierney
Nadler	Rush	Toomey
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Turner (OH)
Neal (MA)	Ryan (WI)	Turner (TX)
Ney	Ryun (KS)	Udall (CO)
Northup	Sabo	Udall (NM)
Norwood	Sanchez, Linda	Upton
Nunes	T.	Van Hollen
Nussle	Sanchez, Loretta	Velazquez
Oberstar	Sanders	Visclosky
Obey	Sandlin	Vitter
Olver	Saxton	Walden (OR)
Ortiz	Schakowsky	Walsh
Osborne	Schiff	Wamp
Ose	Schrock	Waters
Otter	Scott (GA)	Watson
Owens	Scott (VA)	Watt
Oxley	Sensenbrenner	Waxman
Pallone	Serrano	Weiner
Pascarell	Sessions	Weldon (FL)
Pastor	Shadeeg	Weldon (PA)
Payne	Shaw	Weller
Pearce	Shays	Wexler
Pelosi	Sherman	Whitfield
Pence	Sherwood	Wicker
Peterson (MN)	Shimkus	Wilson (NM)
Peterson (PA)	Shuster	Wilson (SC)
Petri	Simpsons	Woolsey
Pickering	Simpson	Wu
Pitts	Skelton	Wynn
Platts	Slaughter	Young (AK)
Pombo	Smith (MI)	Young (FL)

NAYS—4

Flake	Miller (FL)
Garrett (NJ)	Paul

NOT VOTING—13

Akin	Kilpatrick	Tauzin
Bachus	Kind	Towns
Bell	Larson (CT)	Wolf
Delahunt	McDermott	
Gallegly	Nethercutt	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that approximately 2 minutes remain in this 5-minute vote.

□ 1341

So the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I was pushing the button when time went off. I understand it, but had I been present, I would like to have been recorded as voting “yea.”

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and unable to record my vote on rollcall vote No. 7, the Unemployment Insurance Benefits Extension Act. Had I been able to record my vote, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 7 I am not recorded. I would have voted "yea."

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 7, apparently the card did not register a "yes" vote. Let the RECORD show had the machine recorded the vote, I would have voted in the affirmative.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained this afternoon at a news conference reporting on my recent fact-finding trip to Ethiopia to observe the famine conditions and did not vote on rollcall Nos. 6 and 7. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the motion to recommit S. 23, and "yea" on final passage of S. 23, to extend unemployment insurance benefits.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1 AND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 2, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 15 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 15

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the joint resolution equally divided and controlled by Representative Young of Florida and Representative Obey of Wisconsin; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 2) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the joint resolution equally divided and controlled by Representative Young of Florida and Representative Obey of Wisconsin; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 15 is a closed rule providing for the consideration of two continuing resolutions, H.J. Res. 1 and H.J. Res. 2, both of which make further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2003. The rule provides that

H.J. Res. 1 will be debatable in the House for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of H.J. Res. 1, and it provides one motion to recommit the underlying measure. H.J. Res. 15 also provides that H.J. Res. 2 will be debatable in the House for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of H.J. Res. 2. It provides one motion to recommit.

As we start this year's legislative session, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule so we may proceed to consideration of the two underlying continuing resolutions, both of which will allow the Federal Government to remain open until the end of this month. Failure to pass these measures would mean the government, outside of the defense and military construction appropriations bills, would have to shut down on midnight this Friday, January 10. We simply cannot allow that to happen to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a good reason, other than nostalgia, to explain why we are still trying to complete our work from 2002. The rest of America has already celebrated the new year. They have already started to write 2003 on their checks. But for the House of Representatives, the calendar year has not turned.

Every year this House has the responsibility to pass the 13 appropriation bills that keep this government running.

□ 1345

Funding for education, health care, environmental protection, homeland security, national defense all must originate here. The scorecard from the last Congress shows that the majority could only pass 2 of these 13 bills. So we are here today to consider a sixth continuing resolution to keep the government open and running. We are here for one simple reason: The majority party in this House has failed. They did not do their job, and the American people deserve to know that.

Members of this House get up all of the time and give great speeches about how much they value education, about how no child should be left behind. But when it comes to actually funding education, the majority says maybe we will get to it later.

I just met with leaders from hospitals and home health care agencies and nursing homes in Massachusetts

that are struggling just to hold on. They need relief and they need it now; but when it comes to actually funding our health care system, the majority says maybe we will get to it later.

Where is our commitment to our police, our firefighters and other first responders? Where is our commitment to environmental protection, and funding for our transportation and infrastructure needs? Certainly not in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, later is not good enough. We need to act now on the issues that matter to the American people. Indeed, we should have acted yesterday. As even senior Republican appropriators have pointed out, we are leaving ourselves extremely underfunded in the area of homeland security. Take a look at port security, for example. Right now 21,000 shipping containers arrive in U.S. ports every day, each one big enough to carry a weapon of mass destruction, but less than 2 percent are actually screened.

As the Washington Post has reported, Customs Commissioner Robert Bonner has said there is virtually no security for what is the primary system to transport global trade.

Worse yet, the rule before us prevents Democrats from even offering amendments to correct that mistake and provide that critical funding. Somehow, the majority found time last year to pass huge tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, but not much else. We hear a lot of talk about homeland security, but we are not funding our homeland security needs.

This is a time for New Year's resolutions. I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will resolve to bring our appropriation bills to the floor in a timely manner and let the House work its will, vote and move on. The American people deserve a House of Representatives that functions, that does the job given to it by the Constitution, and I hope that we can at least achieve that much during this new year.

Mr. Speaker, there will be a vote on the previous question, and I urge my colleagues to vote no on that previous question. A no vote will allow Democrats to offer important amendments to fund some of our vital interests.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, of course the CR before us is not supposed to have items that raise the cost of government, nor agreement on what the cost should be. There is a sleeper item in this CR that Members need to know about because it certainly raises the cost of government a great deal and a great deal more than was necessary.

We are treated in this CR to a lease. That is I must say an unprecedented circumvention of the committee process. Perhaps that could be justified

under some circumstances. There are three hugely negative consequences for doing so today. We have raised the price of the interim headquarters for the Homeland Security Department. We have disrespected the committee which was in a position to help mitigate the price and the length of the lease, and we have undermined the economy of the Nation's capital. Let me say a word about each of those.

First, raise the price. What we have here is something that gives every appearance of a sweetheart lease. It was supposed to be 5 years, it is 10 years, which is more than is necessary because this is an interim headquarters. This is not the headquarters. It cannot be cancelled. It is for \$250 million, a quarter of a billion dollars for a 10-year lease. After 10 years, we could have bought a building. Why would we lease a building for 10 years at a time when we are cutting appropriations to smithereens.

We disrespected the committee to the detriment of this lease because the committee had ideas about how to meet the deadline without signing such a long lease that in effect bought the building, but at the end of 10 years taxpayers will have nothing to show for a 10-year lease. A quarter of a billion dollars is the least of it. We are going to have to add millions more to enhance the security of this leased building, this building we do not own. We could have built this building.

Finally, we have undermined the economy of the Nation's capital. What has been done is the Federal Government has taken all of the most valuable land in the District of Columbia off for yourself. Having done that, all we get in return are Federal jobs. We cannot tax the people who come in here for their Federal jobs, but at least they can leave their disposable income here. Now we will not even have that.

Mr. Speaker, according to a survey that we had done, a study that we had done, the cost to the District of Columbia over 10 years is a loss of \$342 million. We cannot replace that money. Under the Constitution, there are only two sectors in the Nation's capital, government and tourism. We are leaving the Nation's capital without an economy. We had no fair chance to compete for the interim headquarters.

Mr. Speaker, sadly the District of Columbia had no fair chance to even compete for the interim headquarters. That is clear if we review the language of the request for proposal. They preselected the suburbs from the beginning. The language gave it away. They might as well have said, "We want to locate this in Northern Virginia." What they said instead is we want an office park setting. Give me a break. We do not have office parks in big cities.

They took out what is standard in all RFPs for Federal sites, and that is that there be access to a Metro. That means that the residents of the District of Columbia, those particularly in the lower

levels, do not have any way to get there from here. This is a heartless thing to do to the Nation's capital, but that is what has been done.

Let me put Members on notice, all the District of Columbia asks is not that we get a site, but that we have a fair chance to get a site. This administration did not give us a fair chance to get the interim headquarters. We will not allow the Homeland Security Department to be the only department other than the Pentagon whose headquarters are located outside of the District of Columbia. The Pentagon had to be located out of the District of Columbia because there was not enough room for it. There is enough room for the Department of Homeland Security in the Nation's capital. We insist that the permanent headquarters be located here, and I ask Members of this body to assist us in making sure that happens.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have been in this body for 10 years, and each year we have had continuing resolutions, both when I served in the minority and also in the majority. They are always unfortunate because it holds up the work of this House.

I would say to my colleagues a little lesson in history, in the 107th Congress the House passed 58 bills, 58 bills that the other body refused to either take up or pass. They gridlocked them. I would say that this body did its work. We passed bills. And regardless of the gridlock in the other body, we did many things together, Republican and Democrats, that helped the American people. I worked with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, including the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), whom I serve with on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, we intercepted a memo from James Carville, a political partisan, Democrat operative, and it was entitled, "It's the Economy, Stupid," and he recommended two things to the other body, one that they not pass a budget. Why? Because a good example is prescription drugs. The House did its work. We passed prescription drug legislation two times in this body. The last time was for \$350 billion, more than the other side of the aisle requested during the first go-round, yet it did not satisfy them. Carville and the other body, they requested \$1.3 trillion for prescription drugs in their first go-round. Why? So they could bad mouth Republicans to specific interest groups. And in the 13 appropriations bills if Democrats do not have a budget, they can put a trillion here and a trillion there. In Labor-HHS, for example, over time it was \$278 billion more, yet they talk about being fiscal conservatives and it just does not add up.

Yes, we did not pass the appropriations bills as the gentleman talked about, but we chose to wait and see what we could do to work it together.

But with the Senate not passing its bills, it made it more and more difficult.

The second portion of the Carville memo recommended that the Senate not pass any of the House bills, which they did. They held 58 of them up during that time, bills that would help the American people, such as the energy bill, and I can tell Members California is very strapped for energy and the need for infrastructure. Yet the other body, upon recommendation, held that bill up.

The economic stimulus package, we all know that the economy, a lot is based on the stock market. We had bills that we passed in this body that would help people regain confidence in the stock market so that the people like from Enron that invested their life savings in a retirement plan would not have some CEO take the whole bundle of wax and leave them with nothing. We heard testimony of a lady that had over \$200,000 in her retirement account. After Enron, she had like \$15,000 in her retirement account. The gentleman says we did not do our work, but the Senate refused to take up legislation. They refused to take up an energy bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would tell Members yes, we did not pass appropriations bills, but we were not going to play the Carville game.

Secondly, when the Democrats had majority in this place, we remember in 1993 when they said they were going to help the middle class. They increased the tax on the middle class, after months and months of the then-majority leader saying that they were going to cut taxes on the middle class. They increased the tax on Social Security. That is because they had a President in the White House that would sign it. They increased the tax on gas. They even had a retroactive tax. They took every dime out of the Social Security Trust Fund. They cut veterans' COLAS and military COLAS, and this is when they had control. They passed it because they had large numbers in the majority in the other body.

In the other body, we have a 2-vote margin. We do not have 60 votes to pass things in the Senate. They are not like the House where it is a simple majority. Yes, in the future there is also going to be gridlock from the Senate because the same partisan Democrats that held up legislation in the Senate when they were in the majority are going to hold up legislation on the Senate side.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair would advise Members not to make improper references to the Senate or characterization of Senate action or inaction.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of things that we can come together on in this House over the next 2 years; but, if we look at the pending bill, all I have heard so far is vitriolic, partisan points at the Republican Party. That is not going to get

Members anywhere; it just makes us madder, like it makes the other side of the aisle madder when they do not get their way.

There is a lot of things we can do together, which we do within the committees themselves. But when it comes to the leadership of the Democrat Party, that is their goal, to gridlock, to hold things up like over the past 2 years.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

□ 1400

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me just point out, the name of our party is not the Democrat Party. It is the Democratic Party. We would appreciate it if we would at least be called by our proper name, okay?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman and my friend from Wisconsin. The Democratic Party. I meant nothing by that and the gentleman knows that. But there are a lot of things we can do and most of these freshmen that came have ideals, actually sitting down and working together. Unfortunately, we have got a Presidential election, and there is a lot at stake for the parties. Myself, I am a fighter. The gentleman knows me by now, over 10 years. But I would much rather sit down with the gentleman from Wisconsin and with the leadership of the Democratic Party and work out these things instead of this bickering. It hurts all of us.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to say to the gentleman from California that I am sorry that my comments made him mad, but I will restate my position, that I believe that the majority party failed to do its job in the last Congress. You are in charge. You have the majority. You are supposed to pass these 13 appropriations bills and you failed to do so. As a result, here we are talking about our sixth continuing resolution; and we are underfunding education, we are underfunding health care, we are underfunding environmental protection, we are underfunding homeland security; and I think the American people are furious over the inability of the leadership of this Congress to lead. That is your job.

I would also simply point out to the gentleman that rather than adjourning early to get an early jump on Christmas shopping, we should have remained in session and worked out the differences with the other body; and we should have stayed here, remained here until we did our work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening here today is that the democratic processes in the institution that is supposed to represent the finest of democratic tra-

ditions in the world are being mutilated, and I want to explain what I mean by that.

The majority party for the last year has been able to prevent this House from making any significant decisions whatsoever on 90 percent of the domestic budget. They have succeeded in preventing the education, health and labor bill from coming to the floor for a vote. They succeeded in preventing the science budget, the housing budget, the veterans budget and others from coming to the floor.

And now that we are past the election, they are now doing two things. By this resolution before us today, they are making it possible for the House to consider two resolutions, both of which will be sent to the Senate. The first resolution will continue the authority to keep the government open for 1 month, and the second resolution will be used as a vehicle to which the Senate will then attach all of the remaining appropriation bills as they have been worked out in the Senate. It will be attached to that vehicle and then sent back here for an up-or-down vote, and no Member will have any opportunity to affect that package in any way whatsoever. That will mean that we will have gone an entire year without any degree of accountability for the actions of either the majority party or the minority party. Our last opportunity to affect the content of that budget comes today on these resolutions. We are being denied again an opportunity to provide any meaningful alternative to the proposition that is being put together by the majority party.

The House rules say that if the Committee on Appropriations has not passed what is called a 302(b) allocation under which it takes its spending authority and allocates that authority to the 13 different subcommittees, if the committee has not done that, then the rules of the House say that the House cannot consider an appropriation bill. The Committee on Rules agreed to waive that provision for the majority, so they are allowing the majority to bring a bill to the floor allowing for a huge amount of spending, but they did not afford the same privilege to the minority. That means that we cannot offer any meaningful amendment to the funding level being provided by the majority.

There are reasons for rules. Whether you are talking about a New York Giants-San Francisco 49ers game or whether you are talking about the House floor, the purpose of rules is to see to it that everybody is treated the same. What this rule in essence says is that there is only one team that can even touch the ball; that is, the Republican majority team. And it says the Democratic team can have no opportunity whatsoever to have any impact on the outcome. That destroys the ability of this place to be a legitimate representative body.

After the election, I was watching McNeil-Lehrer, and I noticed in the

panel that they had, the moderator asked the panel, what were the roles going to be for the Republican and Democratic Party after the election. When they discussed the Democratic Party, Tom Oliphant, the distinguished columnist, said, "Well, they are now the minority party and so it is their responsibility to offer alternatives to the majority party's propositions." That is correct. But we are being denied by this rule by the majority party the opportunity to offer meaningful alternatives. That is bad for us, but it is also bad for the majority party because it means that there is no way to hold the majority party accountable for its decisions and there is no way to judge whether their decisions or ours are better, or more in tune with the country's needs. That is a disastrous result in what is supposed to be the most representative body on the face of the Earth.

If we had not been boxed out by the illegitimate action of the Committee on Rules, what we wanted to do is to offer a simple amendment which would put the House on record supporting expenditures which the majority party has already voted for on the supplemental. We wanted to make certain that the \$2.5 billion in homeland security items, for port security, for border security, for FBI computers, et cetera, we wanted to make certain that those contingent appropriations which were frozen by the President, we wanted to give the House an opportunity to say that those items should be provided in this continuing resolution. The President has stonewalled on those \$2.5 billion worth of items.

And we also wanted the House to reaffirm its support for \$275 million of additional veterans medical care, for \$200 million additional funding to fight terrorism in the Middle East, which we would have provided to Israel. The election reform money which both parties posed for political holy pictures about early on, we wanted to provide that. And we are being denied the opportunity to provide all of it. None of that adds to the spending level of the Republican-approved budget resolution. It does add to the level in this bill, but this bill is substantially below that resolution. Yet we are being denied the opportunity to strengthen the homeland security of this country because of the partisan needs of the majority party. I think that is illegitimate.

The other thing we wanted to do is to see to it that the Securities and Exchange Commission is funded at the level promised in the Sarbanes-Oxley bill so that we could in fact put our money where our mouth is and afford investors decent protection from corporate fraud in their balance statements and in their accounting. We are being denied by the Republican majority the opportunity to do that as well.

That is why we are going to be asking this body to vote against the previous question on the rule so that we

can in fact offer this legitimate amendment, to offer these items which all of you, at least 90 percent of you on the majority party side of the aisle have already voted for. The items I am asking people to allow have already been supported by 90 percent of the Republicans and Democrats in the Senate and the House. I do not think that would be too much to ask if this House were a legitimate democratic body, which apparently the House is not. Democracy in this House is being shredded. The Republican Party is simply afraid to vote on these issues because they know that they would either lose the vote or else have a substantial segment of the American people saying to them, "What in God's name were you thinking when you turned those items down?" This is an illegitimate action, an illegitimate, arrogant and anti-democratic, small "d," operation, and the majority party ought to be ashamed of themselves.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

(Mr. OBERSTAR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in opposition to the rule. By prohibiting a motion to strike the imprudent and fiscally irresponsible language in the continuing resolution concerning the housing of the new Department of Homeland Security, this rule circumvents fair, deliberative legislative process. This language in the CR authorizes the government to enter into a long-term lease for a building in Virginia to house some of the employees of the new department. The Bush administration and the House Republican leadership have thereby created a Department of Homeland Security that itself is not secure. This was a back-door deal done without participation from House Democrats, and frankly very little participation by House Republican leadership and members on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Here is how: the CR says that the prospectus to lease the property is deemed approved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. We have not even considered it. We have not even seen it in open committee hearing process. In fact, it was not approved by our committee or any other relevant committee of either the House or the Senate. We did not have a chance to meet and discuss it. The prospectus was signed on Christmas Eve and delivered through the mail slot in our door the day after Christmas when people were on leave. The new department and the security of the people who work there, frankly, are far too important for this kind of gimmickry; and in the process, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has been marginalized and trivialized.

This secretive process avoids answering questions by the administration, such as does the commercial office space that they have chosen meet basic security standards, such as a 100-foot setback to protect against truck bombs? Does it have shatterproof windows? Neither of these issues is addressed in the prospectus, nor in the CR.

At the signing of the Homeland Security Act, President Bush said, "Our objective in creating this department is to spend less on overhead and more on protecting neighborhoods, borders, waters and skies from terrorists." Well, this lease is going to cost the government a quarter of a billion dollars over 10 years, and in addition the government is going to have to spend tens of millions of dollars to make necessary security enhancements to the building. That is not keeping overhead costs down. Furthermore, they have got a leased building. After investing all the money, the Bush administration is clearly prepared to walk away from that investment and stick the taxpayers with the bill. A better solution is for the Federal Government to build a new facility to house the department. We proposed that solution last year in committee. The House passed it in July as part of the Homeland Security Act. It did not continue in the final legislation, but nonetheless there is a long-standing provision of Federal law that requires Cabinet-level offices to be built in the District of Columbia.

□ 1415

Common sense tells us it is better to own your house than rent it, and this building is not going to hold the 17,000 employees of the new department headquarters. At most it is going to hold 2,200 people on a 10-year lease that if they try to cancel they are going to pay a huge price. This is fiscally irresponsible. It is a disrespect to the people, it is a disrespect to the public discussion and legislative process, and under the rubric of security, secretive process is not appropriate.

Vote against the rule and against the CR.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that my major concern is that we need not continue this abdication of our responsibility to the Senate. This is the second bill in a row that we have said let the Senate take care of it. The people of this country elected us in the House of Representatives to take care of some business as well.

The other point is that I would like to have a voice before we cut education, which this will do. I would like to have a voice before we cut veterans care and appropriations for our veterans who served in our wars, and particularly low income energy assistance,

particularly at this time of cold weather. We will have none of that, none of that if we move in this direction. We cannot start this year by consistently setting a pattern of abdicating our responsibility here in the House of Representatives and keep saying let the Senate do it. Is that what we are going to do when we go back and we campaign and when the people ask "What did you do on that vote? Did you have a say?" No, we just voted to extend the shell, let it go over there to the Senate, let them do the work, and then they just pass it back.

So I urge the Members to let us take another look at this and let us do the will of the people and let this House of Representatives stand up and be the House that we are out there on the campaign trail telling people send me to the House of the people and let me do the people's will. Not one time did we say send me to the House and I will abdicate and let the Senate do our will.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The Chair would respectfully remind the gentleman, as he previously reminded the other Member, to refrain from improper references to the Senate.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is a close contest as to which aspect of this bill is more outrageous, its terribly deficient substance or its antidemocratic procedure. As to the substance, as the gentleman from Wisconsin just mentioned, this bill continues the Republican position of complete and total hypocrisy with regard to corporate accountability. When the Sarbanes-Oxley bill was signed, the President quite proudly cited this as an example of his concern for increased corporate accountability. A key piece of that bill which the President signed called for an increased appropriation for the Securities and Exchange Commission so it could do the large number of new responsibilities it is given by Sarbanes-Oxley. Consistently since the passage of this bill at every budget opportunity, the Republican majority in this House has refused to make one penny of that available so that none of the additional responsibilities of Sarbanes-Oxley have been funded. This bill continues the pattern of hypocrisy, of having called for and signed into law funding for Sarbanes-Oxley to the SEC and not providing it. The President has sent up before that for fiscal 2004. Of course given this Committee on Appropriations and this House's track record, fiscal 2004 will not be passed until late in 2004, but even if it were to be in an unprecedented way passed on time, it will have been over a year and a half between the signing of the bill and its funding.

Similarly, let me warn Members that when they go back from here, they will be told by public housing authorities if they have them in their district and people who administer section 8 that this appropriation substantially underfunds both, public housing authorities for a combination of reasons, including the incompetence which has kept the bill from being passed in a timely fashion and the priorities of an administration that is in power. Public housing authorities will not be given enough operating money to run their budgets.

When the Republican majority at the President's behest abolished the drug elimination program by which public housing authorities fought drug use, they were told, well, that is okay, they can fund it out of their regular operating budget, but now comes the second part of that. They have underfunded the operating budget. So first they say fund that \$300 million program nationally out of their operating budgets and then they cut the operating budgets by hundreds of millions more so there will be no chance of doing that.

So the Sarbanes-Oxley bill is rendered once again a nullity under this in substantial part. The public housing authorities are given too little money to do their basic operations, and there is not enough money to continue the existing section 8 contracts, and as I guess as an admission of the indefensibility of this bill, the Republicans have of course come up with the most anti-democratic procedure imaginable so that no amendment addressing any aspect of what I have just talked about will be in order. So we have I guess a synergy, a terrible bill which can only be put forward with an outrageous procedure.

Mr. Speaker, I would just repeat because people ought to understand that there is a synergy here. It is a bill so deficient in its substance that it can only be brought to the floor under an antidemocratic procedure that presents the substance from being addressed. And let me say Members of this body who vote for this rule and prevent any amendment, when they go back to their districts and talk about their support for public housing authorities that are in trouble, the elderly housing with the drug problems that they want to fight, talk about their commitment to Sarbanes-Oxley, will be telling people things that will be in direct contrast to their actions. Vote for this rule and you vote to keep the funding needed to make Sarbanes-Oxley a reality, you vote against allowing the public housing authorities to meet their basic operating needs so that when elderly people complain to you about the problems of heat, the problems of law enforcement, the problems of maintenance, understand that voting for this rule makes you responsible for that.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman if there are any requests for time on his side?

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thought we had a double-header here, but apparently we have a trifecta. Not only do we have a bill that is lousy in its substance and indefensible so that procedurally no amendment can be offered, but it is in both cases so bad that the majority will not even explain or defend it. So the procedure is bad, the substance is worse, and the majority confirms that by refusing quite sensibly to try to say a word in its defense.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me close for our side by again expressing our frustration on this side of the aisle that we are still dealing with last year's work. The fact that we are dealing with the six continuing resolutions before us today I do believe is a failure of the majority party's leadership in the last Congress, and it continues in this Congress. As we bring this bill to the floor, we continue to undercut and underfund education and health care and transportation needs as speaker after speaker has already said.

We are going to call for a vote on the previous question, and I am going to urge people to vote no on the previous question. This rule is unfair, it is undemocratic, it is arrogant, and this is an issue of fairness. The majority has waived the budget rules for themselves, but they have not waived those rules for the minority. This is another abuse of power, and maybe in his closing statement the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), my friend, can explain why one set of rules applies to the majority and a different set applies to the minority in dealing with an issue of this importance. By defeating the previous question, we will restore some fairness to this debate, to this process, by applying the waiver of budget rules to the motion to recommit so that we can offer a meaningful motion to recommit and we can provide the funding, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said earlier, to the SEC so that it gets the proper funding as authorized by the Sarbanes-Oxley bill. It also can provide much needed moneys for homeland security which, for all of our talk about homeland security, we continue to underfund important needs. It provides important moneys for veterans medical care. Everybody talks about how we are committed to veterans, and yet here we are again moving forward on a bill that underfunds veterans medical care and we are not even being allowed an opportunity to correct this. So I would urge all of my colleagues to vote no on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment into the RECORD just prior to the vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request by the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), who worried about the fact that the Republicans were not defending the bill during the discussion on the rule, under the regular order during the discussion of the 1-hour debate on the rule, we should be discussing the rule. We will be delighted to defend the substance of our bills in the subsequent debate on the bills.

The material previously referred to by Mr. McGOVERN is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 15 OFFERED BY MR. McGOVERN

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the joint resolution equally divided and controlled by Representative Young of Florida and Representative Obey of Wisconsin; and (2) one motion to recommit.

Sec. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 2) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the joint resolution equally divided and controlled by Representative Young of Florida and Representative Obey of Wisconsin; and (2) one motion to recommit.

Sec. 3. During consideration of House Joint Resolution 1 and House Joint Resolution 2, points of order against amendments for failure to comply with section 302(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5

minutes the time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

Members will be reminded that the Chair will strictly enforce the 15-minute rule.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 198, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—225

Aderholt	Garrett (NJ)	Osborne
Akin	Gerlach	Ose
Bachus	Gibbons	Otter
Baker	Gilchrest	Oxley
Ballenger	Gillmor	Paul
Barrett (SC)	Gingrey	Pearce
Bartlett (MD)	Goode	Pence
Barton (TX)	Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)
Bass	Goss	Petri
Beauprez	Granger	Pitts
Bereuter	Graves	Platts
Biggert	Green (TX)	Pombo
Bilirakis	Green (WI)	Porter
Bishop (UT)	Gutknecht	Portman
Blackburn	Hall	Pryce (OH)
Blunt	Harris	Putnam
Boehlert	Hart	Quinn
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Bonilla	Hayes	Ramstad
Bonner	Hayworth	Regula
Bono	Hefley	Rehberg
Boozman	Hensarling	Renzi
Bradley (NH)	Herger	Reynolds
Brady (TX)	Hobson	Rogers (AL)
Brown (SC)	Hoekstra	Rogers (KY)
Brown-Waite,	Hostettler	Rogers (MI)
Ginny	Hulshof	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Burns	Hyde	Royce
Burr	Isakson	Ryan (WI)
Burton (IN)	Issa	Ryun (KS)
Buyer	Istook	Saxton
Calvert	Janklow	Schrock
Camp	Jenkins	Sensenbrenner
Cannon	Johnson (CT)	Sessions
Cantor	Johnson (IL)	Shadegg
Capito	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Carter	Jones (NC)	Shays
Castle	Keller	Sherwood
Chabot	Kelly	Shimkus
Chocola	Kennedy (MN)	Shuster
Coble	King (IA)	Simmons
Cole	King (NY)	Simpson
Collins	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Combest	Kirk	Smith (NJ)
Cox	Kline	Smith (TX)
Crane	Knollenberg	Souder
Crenshaw	Kolbe	Stearns
Cubin	LaHood	Sullivan
Culberson	Latham	Sweeney
Cunningham	LaTourette	Tancredo
Davis, Jo Ann	Leach	Tauzin
Davis, Tom	Lewis (CA)	Taylor (NC)
Deal (GA)	Lewis (KY)	Terry
DeLay	Linder	Thomas
DeMint	LoBiondo	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas (OK)	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo	Tiberi
Doolittle	McCotter	Toomey
Dreier	McCrery	Turner (OH)
Duncan	McHugh	Upton
Dunn	McInnis	Vitter
Ehlers	McKeon	Walden (OR)
Emerson	Mica	Walsh
English	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Everett	Miller (MI)	Weldon (FL)
Feeney	Miller, Gary	Weldon (PA)
Ferguson	Moran (KS)	Weller
Flake	Murphy	Wicker
Fletcher	Musgrave	Wilson (NM)
Foley	Myrick	Wilson (SC)
Forbes	Ney	Wolf
Fossella	Northup	Young (AK)
Franks (AZ)	Norwood	Young (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Nunes	
Gallely	Nussle	

NAYS—198

Abercrombie	Baird	Berman
Ackerman	Baldwin	Berry
Alexander	Ballance	Bishop (GA)
Allen	Becerra	Bishop (NY)
Andrews	Bell	Blumenauer
Baca	Berkley	Boswell

Boucher	Israel	Pallone
Boyd	Jackson (IL)	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Jackson-Lee	Pastor
Brown (OH)	(TX)	Payne
Brown, Corrine	Jefferson	Pelosi
Capps	John	Peterson (MN)
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy
Cardin	Jones (OH)	Price (NC)
Cardoza	Kanjorski	Rahall
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Rangel
Carson (OK)	Kennedy (RI)	Reyes
Case	Kildee	Rodriguez
Clay	Klecza	Ross
Clyburn	Kucinich	Rothman
Conyers	Lampson	Roybal-Allard
Cooper	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Costello	Lantos	Rush
Cramer	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Sabo
Cummings	Lee	Sanchez, Linda
Davis (AL)	Levin	T.
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (FL)	Lipinski	Sanders
Davis (IL)	Lofgren	Sandlin
Davis (TN)	Lowey	Schakowsky
DeFazio	Lucas (KY)	Schiff
DeGette	Lynch	Scott (GA)
DeLauro	Majette	Scott (VA)
Deutsch	Maloney	Serrano
Dicks	Markley	Sherman
Dingell	Marshall	Skelton
Doggett	Matheson	Slaughter
Dooley (CA)	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Doyle	McCarthy (MO)	Snyder
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	Solis
Emanuel	McCollum	Spratt
Engel	McDermott	Stark
Eshoo	McGovern	Stenholm
Etheridge	McIntyre	Strickland
Evans	McNulty	Stupak
Farr	Meehan	Tanner
Fattah	Meek (FL)	Tauscher
Finer	Meeks (NY)	Taylor (MS)
Ford	Menendez	Thompson (CA)
Frank (MA)	Michaud	Thompson (MS)
Frost	Millender-	Tierney
Gephardt	McDonald	Turner (TX)
Gonzalez	Miller (NC)	Udall (CO)
Gordon	Miller, George	Udall (NM)
Grijalva	Mollohan	Van Hollen
Gutierrez	Moore	Velazquez
Harman	Moran (VA)	Visclosky
Hastings (FL)	Murtha	Waters
Hill	Nadler	Watson
Hinchey	Napolitano	Watt
Hinojosa	Neal (MA)	Waxman
Hoeffel	Oberstar	Weiner
Holden	Obey	Wexler
Holt	Olver	Woolsey
Honda	Ortiz	Wu
Hoyer	Owens	Wynn

NOT VOTING—10

Delahunt	Kilpatrick	Towns
Greenwood	Kind	Whitfield
Houghton	Nethercutt	
Inslee	Pickering	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON) (during the vote). The Chair advises Members that approximately 2 minutes remain on the 15-minute clock.

□ 1447

Messrs. ISRAEL, DAVIS of Tennessee, HOYER, GORDON, KANJORSKI, and EVANS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, today, January 8, due to family considerations, I unfortunately was not able to vote on several rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 5. I also would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 6, “yes” on rollcall No. 7, and “no” on rollcall No. 8.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1448

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11) to extend the National Flood Insurance Program.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Flood Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2003”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION.—The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended—

(1) in section 1309(a)(2) (42 U.S.C. 4016(a)(2)), by striking “December 31, 2002” and inserting “December 31, 2003”;

(2) in section 1319 (42 U.S.C. 4026), by striking “after” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “after December 31, 2003.”;

(3) in section 1336(a) (42 U.S.C. 4056(a)), by striking “ending” and all that follows through “in” and inserting “ending December 31, 2003, in”; and

(4) in section 1376(c) (42 U.S.C. 4127), by striking “December 31, 2002” and inserting “December 31, 2003”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall be considered to have taken effect on December 31, 2002.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to alert my colleagues that this is not the Ohio State resolution. That comes next.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation, and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, today we consider a bill I have introduced to reauthorize the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Flood Insurance Program, which expired on December 31. Joining me in cosponsoring this legislation are 31 other Members of Congress, almost equally divided between Republicans and Democrats.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and I have been in contact with our counterparts in the Senate, who are in agreement with us on the need for immediate reauthorization of this important program. This is an important, noncontroversial, bipartisan bill that demands our attention so Americans will be protected from disaster and flood losses.

Despite last minute efforts to remedy the situation, authorization for the NFIP expired at the end of last year. The current continuing resolution, which extends fiscal year 2002 baseline funding through January 3, 2003, does not extend the NFIP authorization. Until the NFIP authority is reauthorized, FEMA cannot issue or renew flood insurance policies and cannot borrow funds to cover claims that may arise.

Realtors, homebuilders, mortgage bankers, and other real estate professionals in every one of the 20,000 communities covered by the NFIP are deeply and rightly concerned by the fact that real estate contracts cannot go to closing until this program is reauthorized. Countless small businesses, as well as current and prospective homeowners, are gravely concerned.

I have been in touch with the regulators and asked that they oversee loans during this period to make sure no profiteering takes place as a result of a 1-week lag in the program. We need to make sure that consumers are protected during this period.

By including language in this bill to make the reauthorization retroactive to January 1, 2003, we intend for there to be no gap in this authority, and for all program activity to occur in a seamless manner. Further, it is our intent that any actions taken to renew or enter into new policies would be treated as if the authority were in effect, and that the NFIP pay any claims that may have arisen during this time, or any policies renewed or made effective during this period.

Though there are some who had wanted us to pass a 5-year authorization of the NFIP, our bill opts to reauthorize the program for 1 year only. This is in deference to those Members who have sought to make changes to the flood insurance program in order to prevent costly repetitive loss claims.

With approximately \$200 million being spent on an annual basis on repetitive flood loss properties, it is important that we in the Congress work

with the administration to promote greater fiscal responsibility for the program. The Committee on Financial Services held a valuable hearing on this issue during the last Congress, and I expect we will revisit the subject with another hearing this year.

I want to thank our good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), as well as our counterparts in the other body and the FEMA staff, for their leadership on this issue. The NFIP is an important program that protects 4.4 million property owners with \$623 billion in insurance coverage. It is critical that we reauthorize the program without further delay.

I urge my colleagues to support this important measure so we can get it to the President this week.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding time to me, and thank the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services for their work together in bringing this important legislation to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), my Long Island colleagues, joined me in writing to the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) and to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) last month asking that this bill be among the first the House considers this year. We did so because the program is absolutely vital to our region's homeowners.

Long Island, Mr. Speaker, is indeed an island. To the south we face the Atlantic Ocean and to the north the Long Island Sound. As a result, many in our communities depend upon the National Flood Insurance Program to protect and finance their homes. The program lapsed on December 31, resulting in essentially a halt to all real estate transactions on Long Island's shores until the program was reauthorized. The lapse has exposed homeowners, lenders, and the Federal Government, through the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to catastrophic and uninsured losses in the case of a major weather event.

Mr. Speaker, this is a straight reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program through the end of this year. It has the strong support of the Committee on Financial Services. People on Long Island and around our country need this program.

I want to thank the Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman OXLEY), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), for their leadership on this issue, and for bringing this bill to the floor in such a timely fashion. I look forward to the President's expeditious signature on this matter at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the legislation. I am very pleased to say that it is a 1-year extension, only because it is important that we address the reforms that are necessary for our own constituents and for some of the very important matters brought to us by the managers of the National Flood Insurance Program and FEMA.

During most of my time here in Congress, I have been working on reform legislation for the flood insurance program. I would say it is overdue. With Mr. KENNEDY from Massachusetts, we often tried to make some reforms. We were successful in part. In recent years, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and I have been working on this subject. We have reintroduced legislation today.

We were happy to work with Mr. Bentsen, the former Member from Texas, and we look forward to working with all Members, such as the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER), who has played a key role and has had a great interest in this subject. This is important legislation which the chairman has identified for work this year, so I hope their input will come to us.

Mr. Speaker, again, I rise in strong support of the legislation and urge its passage.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Chair and ranking member for moving this forward expeditiously. It is important. I appreciate their commitment to look at the long term.

My colleague the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) has been working on this for some time. It is a critical program for the lives and livelihood of many people around the country. It is a good example of how the Federal Government can step in and help work with local communities to lessen the impact that disasters have on people's lives and property.

However, as we look at this reauthorization we must indeed look at the big picture, because the Federal Government can do a much better job of providing the right signals and incentives for individuals, communities, and State governments to act responsibly. Unfortunately, some aspects of our disaster policy on the national level are themselves a disaster, including a dominant structural model for flood plain and flood management that has a serious number of problems.

Despite spending over \$40 billion in the last 40 years on flood program management to reduce flooding, we have actually seen flood losses increase to

an average of \$8 billion a year, six times what it was before the program was enacted 40 years ago. Forty percent of the payments go to 2 percent of the property.

We have a serious problem of repetitive flood loss. I have often cited an example of one home in Houston, Texas, with an assessed value of less than \$115,000 that has received over at least 16 losses totaling over \$806,000. It is an example of a program that needs to be corrected.

Flood losses are only going to get more expensive as global warming leads to more extreme weather events. The world's largest banks and insurers are already estimating that the cost of financial losses from events such as this summer's devastating floods in Central Europe and in India will be \$150 billion over the next 10 years.

□ 1500

Our national flood policy often encourages development and rebuilding in places with a predictably high risk of future catastrophic loss. It also fosters an unsustainable reliance on the Federal Government. That is why the Bush administration in one of their first actions upon taking office identified flood insurance reform as one of the areas that could both help the environment and save money. It is an area of reform that was identified by the Clinton administration and James Lee Witt, a FEMA director that we all worked with.

I am pleased to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), in co-sponsoring the Two Flood and You Are Out of the Taxpayer Pocket Act that would reauthorize the program until the year 2007. I will not go into the details other than to say it is the sort of heavy lifting in terms of legislation that will actually unite the administration, environmentalists, people who are fiscally conservative, people who care about being able to make sure that we do not encourage people to put themselves in harm's way.

I appreciate speaking in support of this bill today and look forward with working with people in this Chamber on important reform legislation that can be a source of pride for this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, let me recognize the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for their excellent work on a very important subject, and we appreciate their input.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, in September of 1999, most of the east coast was hit hard by Hurricane Floyd. There were 66 known

deaths, 48 in North Carolina, three in New Jersey, two in New York, six in Pennsylvania, four in Virginia, two in Delaware and one in Vermont. Ten States were declared Federal disaster areas as a result of Hurricane Floyd. These 10 States needed support. In the aftermath of the storm, 4,582 individuals registered for Federal assistance in my home State of New York alone.

The insurance for this kind of storm risk is priced far too high for the average homeowner. The Federal Government passed the Federal Flood Insurance Program in 1968 to provide homeowners in communities which meet certain requirements. In return for coverage, a community adopts and enforces a set of floodplain management ordinances to reduce future flood risk for new construction in floodplain areas.

This program is critical to communities across the country which are threatened by potential floods. This is not a perfect program; but it is something that we need to do, and we need to do it now. It was essential to the recovery of the community in my area of New York in 1999, and it has helped thousands of families nationwide to rebuild their lives after floods. When you see a natural disaster, the pictures of a natural disaster on television or in the papers, flooded homes, flooded schools, flooded churches, this is the money that helps those folks reclaim their communities and reclaim their washed-out lives. Many members believe that this Federal Flood Insurance Program should be reformed, and I support that. I am confident that the Committee on Financial Services will consider Federal flood insurance reform legislation in this Congress.

However, today we are not here to debate reform of the program. Today we are here to ensure that the program can continue for 1 additional year to provide retroactive coverage for those days which have already passed since the authorization expired. December 31st the flood insurance expired because of an oversight in the last continuing resolution. Without this legislation, homeowners are going to be unable to purchase homes in areas threatened by an occasional potential for flooding. This can harm people and it can harm communities and could cause further harm to the economy. So today we need to pass this legislation and I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join in this support of the bipartisan support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to applaud the chairman's Ohio State Buckeyes. Way to go, Buckeyes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI).

(Mr. KANJORSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise, of course, in support of this bill today;

but I want to call my colleagues' attention to the fact that this has happened a little too often in this House. We allowed unemployment compensation to lapse giving a tremendous Christmas present on December 28 to 800,000 unemployed people in this country. The House of Representatives did not think it was important enough that they could have security.

Now we have allowed this bill to lapse by failing just to schedule a bill that passed the Senate by unanimous consent. Some failure of leadership.

Last year I participated in the disaster insurance bill, and for a full year it lagged where technical defaults and failures of commercial building occurred because we had some attempt by the White House or others to attach on tort reform.

As a Member of Congress, I think our first responsibility is to our constituents. And technically, we have put people in technical default of their mortgages with our failure to act last fall.

Now, I think all of our colleagues will support this bill. They would have supported it last fall. Why did we have to have tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of people in the United States receive letters from their insurance carriers that they were in technical default?

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, just for a clarification, the last day of the 107th Congress, the Senate passed a bill, sent it over to the House. We brought it up on unanimous consent, and it was objected to by your side. Just for the record, I wanted to point that out.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I had been asked as the ranking member designate and had no objection to it. So I do not know exactly what the procedure was. We had been told there was an objection on the part of the Republican leadership. We had been willing to approve it.

When I was consulted by the Democratic leadership, I said for this extension we should go forward. So I do not know, this is a different version than I had heard. We had been informed that there was an objection on the Republican side.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, all I can say is I am not aware of what objections were made; but this was perfunctory and should have been performed before we adjourned the last session of the last Congress. It is almost farcical.

Do you realize in my district alone thousands of senior citizens have received letters that they are no longer insured? They are elderly, in their seventies, their 75th, 80th year and they are completely discombobulated with the idea that this Congress would be so

callous as to not respond to their needs. Just as the 800,000 unemployed people are discombobulated today knowing that they do not know when their next unemployment check will come because we failed to extend it before we went home.

Quite frankly, I do not care whether it is a Republican problem or a Democratic problem. I do not think this is a party problem. This is a traffic cop problem for the leadership of this House, and the leadership of this House rests on the Republican control. And I am just calling your attention to it as a Member without partisan feeling.

We cannot afford to allow this to happen in the future. We passed a bill that a bank cannot issue a mortgage on any residence in the United States that is in a flood zone unless they have flood insurance. So technically we were prepared and have for the last 7 or 8 days barred and put into technical default anybody wanting to mortgage or transact residence sales in the United States for the last 7 days. This is ridiculous. This is important.

If you really analyze, we have cost insurance companies, we have cost residences and we have cost constituents across this country millions of dollars and great anxiety for nothing. And all I am urging is let us not have this happen again. This should not be a matter of politics, should not be a matter of who controls the leadership of either side, either body of this House. This is responsible legislation that should have been passed in the last Congress. We failed to.

We have the force also in this legislation for unemployment compensation. It is awfully nice for us to argue over the issues of that question for all this time; but our constituents, 800,000 of them across America, do not know whether or not they will be able to buy groceries this week. That is unacceptable in the United States. And I am only speaking for our average constituents and calling the attention of that to the Members of the House. We cannot continue to allow this to happen.

This should, and I predict will, pass unanimously. I cannot imagine any Member of the House of Representatives that is opposed to giving flood insurance to the American people. So why are we making it a ridiculous thing here 7 days late to come forth with a piece of legislation where there has been a hiatus and technical defaults all over this country, interrupting commerce, interrupting construction, interrupting all kinds of things when our economy is hurting? And we are saying we are being responsible as a body? I think not.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my chairman and my ranking member for finally putting this piece of legislation in a timely way here before the floor on this first legislative day. I think it is important. I urge all my colleagues on the Republican side and the Democratic side to support this legislation unanimously. It is something im-

portant, and it means a great deal to an awful lot of Americans to maintain their homes with some sort of security.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the National Flood Insurance Program Reauthorization Act that would extend for one year the four basic authorities contained in the National Flood Insurance Act.

As many of my colleagues may already know, virtually all residential and commercial mortgage transactions on properties located in flood zones came to a halt on January 1, 2003.

The Senate did attempt to address this problem in the closing days of the 107th Congress. The House, however, regrettably failed to consider the Senate-approved bill before the 107th Congress adjourned.

We must now, as a result, take quick action on this legislation in the House in order to minimize disruptions to homeownership and to protect our already struggling economy.

I am pleased therefore that the leadership has scheduled this legislation for a vote early in the 108th Congress.

This lapse in coverage has already resulted in significant confusion for all parties with an interest in the National Flood Insurance Program. Moving quickly on this bill will help to abate these problems.

From my perspective, it is also of the utmost importance that this bill retroactively reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program.

In January 1996, the Susquehanna River and its tributaries in Northeastern Pennsylvania exceeded their banks and caused considerable flooding. Mother Nature may cause similar flooding in Pennsylvania or elsewhere before we can complete our work in Washington in the coming days.

I am therefore pleased that this bill would protect homeowners in the interim by making these changes effective as of December 31, 2002.

In closing, we should protect homeowners and businesses from financial losses by not allowing the National Flood Insurance Program to lapse into an extended legal limbo.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER).

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) for his leadership in bringing this before the House today.

I feel like it is like election time again. It is rather interesting. Nobody is arguing reform is not necessary. Reform is necessary. But we are talking about global warming. We are talking about senior citizens. They will be losing Social Security next thing we know if this bill drags on more than 5 more minutes.

And leadership, it is amazing, I think about the bills this last year that we voted out of this House that sat on the Democratic leader's desk in the Senate that went nowhere, and yet today we blame leadership on this side of the aisle as the problem for everything that occurred in this Nation.

The fact is that 20,000 communities in this Nation are covered by the national flood hazard law. In January

alone there will be 400,000 households either seeking insurance or seeking to reinsure their home based on an existing policy. And if this does not occur today, that will not happen. That is dangerous and I applaud our chairman for making sure that that is going to happen today; but to sit around and complain about all the ills of society based on what we are trying to resolve and fix today is unreasonable on this floor.

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac represent 85 percent of the secondary mortgages that are in this Nation. Dealing with the other lenders that are out there, they are prohibited by law from making a loan or reloading to a home if people do not have an existing insurance policy. Now, lenders are forced, if people cannot provide a policy, to put a forced policy on a home.

Now, I applaud the gentleman for his concern for seniors; but understand if we do not do this, they will pay double or triple the price for insurance than they would pay in the open market if a lender is forced to place that insurance company on a home for a person on a fixed income or anybody who has a mortgage out there.

If you do not have an existing loan today and you are trying to get one from Fannie Mae, they have given you until January 15 and they will not place loans after that, unless at that point in time they put a forced insurance loan on your house itself; and that forced policy, again, is two to three times the normal price that you would pay on the market today.

We have a problem before us. We have an issue that can be dealt with. I would encourage an "aye" vote in dealing with this issue that should be dealt with and should have been dealt with last year. Nobody is arguing that. I believe reform will occur this year, but for the next 12 months this has to occur to allow the open marketplace to continue as it has in the past.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI).

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond to the former speaker. I hope he did not want to indicate that I am either opposed to the passage of this legislation or suggest that it will not be very successful or will not be needed. Because I certainly do not want him to leave the floor with that impression.

I just want to make sure the record is very clear. This bill did not have any major objection, to my knowledge, on the floor at all. It was held up because of other tactical reasons for other legislation passed by the Senate that did not want to be considered by the leadership of this House after the Senate passed the bill.

I think that is unacceptable as a policy in this House. I am in favor and I will ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, as you do, that we should impose this immediately in the

legislation; and if we have other things to do, let us have our committee hold hearings to find out what has to be done. But we should not penalize, jeopardize and put into such an anxiety state the American people. I just want the record to reflect that.

□ 1515

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) for yielding me the time, and Mr. Speaker, it is nice to see you in the Chair.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill to reinstate the National Flood Insurance Program. It is widely known by the acronym NFIP. I am relieved that it has come to the floor because it is important that it is passed. It is important for many reasons.

Because it did expire on December 21, it would affect 400,000 American homeowners because they will be without coverage by the end of the month. So timeliness is important and it is legitimate to say that this thing could have been taken care of before we left last year. So that is why I am saying I am relieved that it is coming up today.

For those who own property in flood-prone areas, flood insurance is really essential. It is a must and the consequences of the lapse in this program are serious. New policies cannot be issued, and without coverage prospective home buyers may not be able to close on a home. Many of us have closed on a home and we know that there are many parts of that closure. This is an essential piece if someone lives in a flood zone.

Policies cannot be renewed for homeowners whose policies expired after December 31st, and they could be liable for damage, even if they paid their premiums. That is not such a great deal.

Finally, the NFIP will not be able to borrow money to cover claims. So this has to pass, and I do not think that there is anyone that is opposed to it, but we really did not have to come to this point of anxiety.

My constituents have a special association with this coverage. That is because we suffered severe flooding in 1998 in the last El Nino, and hundreds of homes were flooded, many millions of dollars in damage. We can ill afford to be without this flood insurance today.

I want to urge every single person in this House to vote for this. It should be unanimous. It should be bipartisan. The American people deserved to have this taken care of before we left, but as I said, I am relieved it is on the floor now. Let us get this thing done. Let us send it to the President to have him sign it into law. The American people deserve the backing of this kind of insurance coverage and cannot afford to be without it.

I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time. I will be brief.

I am pleased that we were able as the first legislative effort this year to have the Committee on Financial Services bring forward a bipartisan bill that is going to be accepted unanimously. There will be differences on some ideological issues, and I look forward to our being able to debate those in a civil fashion, and I think it is important to note the differences on some issues will in no way interfere with our ability to work together in a cooperative way on the great bulk of issues that are not ideological and not partisan.

So I, as my first act as the ranking minority member, am grateful to the chairman for giving us a chance to come forward this quickly in a bipartisan fashion.

I do want to note that there is one unsung hero in this act and it is an unsung hero that is actually criticized and is unusually in the position of a hero, and that is an entity called the Federal Government. It has become very popular in America today to denounce government.

The people who talk about less government generally are applauded, and we are told that we have to get the government to stop interfering with the private sector, but we are here bringing forward a bill that will be passed unanimously because there are some important issues in this society which the private sector cannot do by itself. If there was not a National Flood Insurance Program, we would have serious difficulties.

I should add that I agree with those who spoke earlier, the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from Oregon, about the need for reform. That is why I was pleased that the gentleman from Ohio took the bait, and I was glad to agree with him in resisting a longer authorization. This is a 1-year authorization, precisely so that we can as a committee work on the kind of reforms that will be both environmentally and fiscally sound that this program can have.

Whether it is reformed in one way or not, it will remain an example of the government coming to the aid of the private sector in dealing with an important national need that the private sector by itself cannot deal with. It is not an entirely government enterprise either. It is an example of private/public sector cooperation, and on that grounds I am glad to have it.

I would also add just for the historical record, I have the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from the last day. At least on the last day of the session in November, no unanimous consent request was made. So I do not see any record that anybody here objected to it, but the important issue is we are bringing forward this bill. I believe it is going to pass unanimously, and it is certainly my commitment and I know the chairman's to begin a process this year so that we can within a few months come

forward with a bill that will have a longer and reformed authorization, and I will be glad to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

In closing, let me thank my good friend from Massachusetts, the new ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services, for his cooperation in this area.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of reauthorizing the FEMA Flood Insurance Program. Yesterday, I introduced a similar piece of legislation, HR 215, and I am very thankful to Chairman OXLEY for bringing this important bill to the floor so that America's homeowners can have the flood insurance many of them desperately need.

I represent a district in southeast Louisiana, a region that is very prone to flooding, perhaps one of the most flood-prone areas in our country. Nearly all of southeast Louisiana falls in flood zones. So, a lapse in this program would be devastating to commerce in Louisiana. Without the flood insurance, banks will not lend mortgage money to prospective home buyers or owners in designated flood zones. Also, any home buyer that was set to close after January 1 would suffer delays without having the required flood insurance coverage.

Living under the constant threat of a flood—much less actually experiencing one—is devastating enough mentally and physically without families having to worry about how to recover financially in the aftermath. With the passage of the important legislation, the real estate market will be able to move forward, and millions of homeowners will be assured they are covered in the event of a catastrophe. I thank the House for considering this today, and I urge a yes vote.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 11.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY BUCKEYES FOOTBALL TEAM

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 10) congratulating the Ohio State University football team for winning the 2002 NCAA Division I-A collegiate football national championship.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 10

Whereas in 2002, the Ohio State University Buckeyes football team captured its fifth undisputed collegiate national football championship;

Whereas The Ohio State University is a member of the Big Ten Conference of the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I-A and in 2002 was the Conference's champion for the 29th time in school history;

Whereas The Ohio State University's 14-0 record in 2002 is the best for a season for a Division I-A football team in national college football history;

Whereas on the way to the national championship Ohio State defeated five nationally ranked opponents, which included a 14-9 triumph over the University of Michigan;

Whereas The Ohio State University entered the Fiesta Bowl as an 11-point underdog to a University of Miami team that was on a 34-game winning streak, yet emerged victorious;

Whereas Head Coach Jim Tressel has won five national college football championships, the 2002 championship being his first Division I-A title and his first with The Ohio State University;

Whereas Coach Tressel and his father Lee Tressel are the only father-son combination to each win National Coach of the Year honors and a national championship in football;

Whereas each player, coach, trainer, and manager dedicated their time and effort to ensuring that the Buckeyes reached the pinnacle of team achievement;

Whereas The Ohio State University Marching Band, and the cheerleaders, students, alumni, faculty, and supporters of The Ohio State University are to be congratulated for their commitment and pride in the Buckeyes' football program; and

Whereas its five Division I-A football national championships makes the Ohio State University football program among the most successful in college football history: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the Ohio State University football team for winning the 2002 NCAA Division I-A collegiate football national championship;

(2) recognizes the achievements of all the players, coaches, and support staff who were instrumental in helping The Ohio State University win the 2002 NCAA Division I-A collegiate football national championship and invites them to the United States Capitol Building to be honored;

(3) requests that the President recognize the accomplishments and achievements of the 2002 Ohio State University football team and invite them to Washington, D.C., for a White House ceremony for national championship teams; and

(4) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make available enrolled copies of this resolution to The Ohio State University for appropriate display and to transmit an enrolled copy of the resolution to each coach and member of the 2002 NCAA Division I-A collegiate football national championship team.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 10.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

As a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, it is a privilege to manage this resolution today on behalf of the committee and for my neighbor and colleague from Columbus, Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), a graduate of the Ohio State University, on the new reigning NCAA national champions of college football, congratulating the Ohio State University on a great season and a great title game.

The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), a huge Buckeye fan, represents the main campus of the Ohio State University and could not be with us today because of leadership obligations.

I, as the other Member of Congress from Columbus, Ohio, have a privilege to manage this resolution today honoring our great football team and a tremendous season, a true story of David versus Goliath, with 13 seniors and many young players on a team in an incredible season, unprecedented season, 14 and 0.

Ohio State brought home its fifth national championship, Mr. Speaker, a classic season and a classic final game for the ages.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H. Res. 10, congratulating Ohio State University for winning the NCAA Division I football championship.

Last Friday, Ohio State captured its fifth national football championship, winning one of the most closely fought college football games in recent memory. College football fans, student athletes and the general public were treated to an exciting Fiesta Bowl and end to this college football season.

I want to extend my hearty congratulations to head coach Jim Tressel, Ohio State University president Karen Holbrook, and Ohio State's student athletes for a job very well done.

I also want to extend my congratulations to the University of Miami and their student athletes for a great season. The University of Miami won all of their games during the regular season and produced two leading Heisman trophy contenders in Ken Dorsey and William McGahee. I know that I speak for all of this Congress as we wish Mr. McGahee a speedy and thorough recovery from the knee injury he sustained during the game.

Winning a championship has brought national acclaim to Ohio State University, and I hope the fans at the university and the university community treasures this moment for many, many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the

distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) from Columbus, Ohio, and an Ohio State grad and a former member of the Ohio State marching band for bringing this resolution to the floor today, and let me say I support the underlying resolution, support and congratulate the Ohio State University on what really was an outstanding season, not only for the coach and the players, the fans, but for all who watched Ohio State go through a number of games where it was very close, games that they were certainly about to lose, including the national championship.

As an old football player myself, I can tell my colleagues the game on January 3, the national championship game, was one of the most exciting football games that I have ever watched or one that I ever played in.

The real credit here goes to Coach Jim Tressel and his players. They did not have the most talented team in the country, not even close, and to win all of the close games all year is a sign of very good coaching and players who come together to create a very good team, and so for myself and my colleagues, our delegation, we want to congratulate the Ohio State University, the coach Jim Tressel, the players and all the fans.

Way to go, Bucks.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services, and a Ohio State University Law School graduate.

(Mr. OXLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and this is indeed a proud day for all Buckeyes. This has been quite a season to see in the ups and downs, and to see this talented group of athletes, student athletes, under the leadership of Coach Jim Tressel was a memorable time for all of us and to see an underdog team perform so well in the Fiesta Bowl for the national championship, with a crowd that was probably 80 to 85 percent made up of scarlet and gray was truly amazing, and as the coach said after the game, he felt that the crowd, very strong crowd, from Ohio State truly made a difference in the outcome, and for that, we are very, very pleased.

The gentleman from Columbus mentioned that I was an Ohio State law grad. That is correct. It is also true that of the four branch campuses of the Ohio State University, I represent three, in Mansfield and Lima and Marion. I have had a long-standing relationship with that great university, and we have seen perhaps the culmination of a season, like no other, where

we have won 14 games, including the national championship.

The last one we won was January 1 of 1969, when I was a senior at Ohio State Law School and got to see Ohio State defeat Southern California. If the gentlewoman from California is listening, we beat USC for the national championship. So Woody Hayes is smiling somewhere today because Ohio State is back on top, and for that we are very, very grateful.

I thank the gentleman from Columbus for his leadership in this area.

As an Ohio State football fan since I was boy, I never thought I'd say this, but there is something bigger than the Michigan game.

Ohio State has a great football history. Going into this year 4 consensus National Championships. 28 Big Ten Championships. 13 Rose Bowl appearances. 6 Heisman Trophy Winners.

But I doubt there will ever be a single game that matches what happened last Friday night at the Fiesta Bowl when the Buckeyes defeated the Miami Hurricanes, 31-24 in overtime, to win their first undisputed national championship since the 1968 team.

I was a student at the Ohio State's law school back then and never dreamed I'd have to wait this long to see the Buckeyes win another championship. But in exchange for a little patience and few frustrating years against our neighboring state to the north, Ohio State fans were able to watch our team play and win the greatest college football game in history.

Under legendary coach Woody Hayes, the Buckeyes usually went into games as the favorites. This time, the experts said Ohio State was overmatched. But Coach Jim Tressel knew that all any team needs to do to win, is make plays. The plays were unforgettable—and there were so many of them!

Maurice Clarett's strip after a crucial Miami interception. Michael Doss's pick-off. Matt Wilhelm's crushing sack. Craig Krenzel's miraculous 4th-and-14 completion in overtime and his quarterback sneak for the touchdown. And the final goal line stand by a valiant defense.

I salute Miami's effort, and you can see why they were the defending champions. But we in Ohio are proud that the Buckeyes won and ever prouder of the way they won: with determination, passion, and courage. This is a team that taught all of us a lesson, and the lesson is: it's only over when you stop trying.

I don't want to wait another 34 years to see Ohio State play for another national championship. But my heart may need that long to recover from this one!

□ 1530

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services mentioned that he represents three of the four branch campuses. I happen to represent the fourth, in Newark, Ohio. So I believe we have the State covered, Mr. Chairman.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) mentioned that Coach Jim Tressel has truly reinvigorated the football program at Ohio State and the fans around the State of Ohio, but also

his belief in college football and what it means to the student athlete, the importance of teamwork and sportsmanship, school spirit and heart; and he was recognized this week as coach of the year by the American Football Coaches Association, a truly well-deserved honor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Springfield, Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), who is a distinguished law school graduate from Ohio State University.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I represent a large part of Franklin County. I would like to thank the gentleman from Columbus for his leadership on this bill. As a former band member, I guess he learned how to march pretty well; and he has done a good job here in Congress.

It was a great game, and both teams need to be congratulated for playing an outstanding game, one of the best traditions in competition. There were no penalties, as I recall, for any unnecessary roughness or unsportsmanlike activities in that game. It was true champions going at each other.

In the final analysis, the champion was Ohio State University. Ohio State University is a champion in many ways, not just in football but in a lot of other endeavors as a university. It is an outstanding university in this country, and it has been my pleasure to work with them on a number of things.

I think there was a time when many people said to themselves, golly, I wonder if this new coach can coach at this level in the Big Ten. Well, I think that has all been put to rest. He is a national coach today. He has a national reputation. And he has shown what a true gentleman can do in recruiting and in coaching this young team to the success that they had this year. He has built a successful football team without sacrificing strong beliefs in the importance of academics for his players. His leadership has paid off with the Buckeyes' having a championship to show for it and memories of a game that people and sports writers are already calling one of the greatest college football games in history.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote something that Coach Tressel said. He said, I believe an accurate quote, "We have always known we had the best damn band in the land. Now we know we have the best damned team in the land." With that, Go Bucks!

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), mentioned, he also represents Franklin County. We also have the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), who represents Franklin County, and as I said represents the main campus of Ohio State University, but

could not be with us on the floor today because of leadership duties. But again, on behalf of the entire Ohio delegation, we want to again congratulate Ohio State University and all of the Buckeye nation for a fantastic season and a well-deserved honor.

As a native of Columbus and an Ohio State graduate and a 4-year member of the Ohio State Marching Band, I want to also congratulate the rest of the folks at Ohio State; not just the team, but the band, the cheerleaders, the entire athletic department, the student athletes who represent other sports, and the students as well of Ohio State University for such a fine honor, as well as to again salute Coach Tressel and the entire organization not only in winning the championship but doing it with class.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, it was with some reluctance that I voted for the OSU resolution.

Much has been said today about the quality of the Ohio State players, coaches, and fans. However, nothing has been said about the refs.

After watching the game I too, wondered about the refs and their ability to be employed in the future. I was pleased to see that they seemed to be in action just a couple days later during the San Francisco-N.Y. Giants game on Sunday.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to pay special tribute to The Ohio State University football team. On January 3rd they finished their season by beating the then number 1 ranked Miami Hurricanes in the Fiesta Bowl. This resulted in their winning the Division 1-A College Football National Championship. This is the university's first title since 1968. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Buckeyes are the first Big 10 team to win the crown since the Bowl Championship Series was implemented in 1998.

The amount of time and effort Coach Tressel, his staff, and the team put into this feat is a tribute to the proud tradition boasted by The Ohio State University. They have proven that even the most difficult goals can be reached through hard work, sacrifice, and dedication.

Mr. Speaker, Jim Tressel is the only coach currently in his profession to win national titles in both Division 1-AA and now Division 1-A. He won four national titles while coaching at Youngstown State and now has his first at Ohio State. His steadfastness toward education and the discipline he demands off the field is a formula to which all coaches should aspire. His win last Friday validates so much more than what a strong defense can do for a team. It shows that character, planning, and responsible decision-making are what really matters in the end. Coach Tressel has built an organization that has taken The Ohio State University back to greatness both on and off the football field. On behalf of Ohio's Fifth Congressional District, I congratulate him, his coaches, and the team on a job well done.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is with tremendous pride that I offer this resolution, which congratulates the Ohio State Buckeyes on their historic win against the Miami Hurricanes in claiming the 2002 Division 1-A national collegiate football championship.

Mr. Speaker, the Buckeyes steadily rose through the national rankings this year under

the unwavering leadership of their second year head coach, Jim Tressel. Starting the season ranked an unlucky 13th, the Buckeyes kept winning and winning, ending up the regular season by beating archrival Michigan 14-9, remaining undefeated and ranked 2nd in the country.

Their record earned Ohio State a trip to Tempe, Arizona to play in the Bowl Championship Series national championship game against the Miami Hurricanes, a game in which the Buckeyes entered as an 11 point underdog.

In that national championship game, ultimately decided in double overtime Ohio State emerged victorious with their offense scoring 31 points and their defense holding Miami for four downs on the two yard line as time expired to win the game. Critics and sports-writers have already called this game arguably the greatest college football game ever played.

The Buckeyes found a breathtaking way to end an equally dramatic season.

From their fourth-down play successes to their 8 come-from-behind victories, Ohio State showed their hearts on the field and won a record setting 14 victories.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take a moment to recognize Coach Tressel, who is in his second year as the Head Coach of the Ohio State Buckeyes. Coach Tressel's stoic, disciplinarian, and consistent style of leadership has restored the Buckeye team to its rightful place among the nation's elite college programs. And, in the process, Coach Tressel has instantly joined coaches Woody Hayes and Paul Brown in the annals of Ohio State's proud athletic history. In two short seasons, Coach Tressel has demonstrated that winning is innate—whether at Division 1-AA (Division 1 double A) Youngstown State or the Ohio State University.

However, the 2002 Buckeye team was perhaps best personified by junior quarterback Craig Krenzel. The consistently under-rated Krenzel, a molecular genetics major carrying a 3.7 GPA, displayed a grit and toughness equal to his intellect by scoring two dramatic touchdowns, leading both teams in rushing yards, and earning the Fiesta Bowl's MVP honor.

Ohio State football history and tradition are the bedrock of Columbus, Ohio—from The Best Damn Band in the Land, the Dotting of the I in Script Ohio to the Horseshoe, Skull Sessions and Hineygate, Ohio State fans are ever mindful of the University's storied past.

Both with and without tickets, some 60,000 adoring OSU faithful traveled to Tempe to cheer on their Buckeyes, coloring Sun Devil Stadium in a sea of scarlet and gray, and giving the Buckeyes a home field advantage some 2000 miles away from Columbus.

As a graduate of The Ohio State University, I take enormous pride in the Ohio State football team's sportsmanship and courage. The Buckeyes showed the world the definition of champions. Their preparation, fortitude, and desire will go down in the history of athletic competition as an example of triumph in the face of adversity. I could not be more pleased to be a fan, alumna, and Representative of The Ohio State University and their championship football team.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The question is on the mo-

tion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 10.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CONGRATULATING THE GRAND VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY LAKERS FOR WINNING THE 2002 NCAA DIVISION II FOOTBALL NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 13) congratulating the Grand Valley State University Lakers for winning the 2002 NCAA Division II Football National Championship.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 13

Whereas on December 14, 2002, the Grand Valley State University Lakers won the 2002 NCAA Division II Football National Championship by defeating Valdosta State University;

Whereas this national championship is the school's first in a varsity sport;

Whereas the Lakers won the 2002 Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (GLIAC) Football Championship with a perfect 9-0 record in league play;

Whereas the Lakers completed the 2002 season with a perfect 14-0 record, and won 33 of its last 34 games;

Whereas Head Coach Brian Kelly has been with the team since 1991, and has led the team to a 104-34-2 overall record;

Whereas the Lakers returned 51 letter winners, including 16 starters from the 2001 team that fell only to North Dakota in the NCAA Division II National Championship game;

Whereas the Lakers placed 18 players on the 2002 All-GLIAC team;

Whereas quarterback Curt Anes was named the GLIAC Player of the Year for the second straight year and earned the 2002 Harlon Hill Trophy as NCAA Division II's most outstanding player;

Whereas the Lakers defense dominated opponents by ranking 34th in the Nation in rushing defense and recording 58 quarterback sacks;

Whereas the students, alumni, faculty, and fans of Grand Valley State University showed their support for by helping the Lakers set a GLIAC record for regular-season attendance; and

Whereas the Lakers have displayed great strength, ability, and perseverance this season and have made the State of Michigan proud: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the Grand Valley State University Lakers for winning the 2002 NCAA Division II Football National Championship and recognizes all the players, coaches, and support staff who were instrumental in this achievement;

(2) requests that the President recognize the accomplishments of the 2002 Grand Val-

ley State University football team and invite them to Washington, D.C., for a White House ceremony for national championship teams; and

(3) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to Grand Valley State University for appropriate display.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 13.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Grand Valley State University Lakers Football Team. On December 14, approximately 3 weeks before the Ohio State Buckeyes became national champions, the Grand Valley State University Lakers Football Team set the national standard by winning the NCAA Division II Football National Championship by defeating Valdosta State University.

In all seriousness, as a Wolverine from the great State of Michigan, just north of the State of Ohio, congratulations to our colleagues of the Big Ten, the Ohio State Buckeyes. It was a great year for the Midwest. My sympathy to my colleagues in other parts of the country who did not enjoy the same type of success the Midwest had this year during the football season.

This game also was an exciting game that pitted the number one ranked Grand Valley State Lakers against the number two ranked and perennial football powerhouse Valdosta State University from the great State of Georgia. Ultimately, the game was won by the Lakers when quarterback Curt Anes threw a 10-yard scoring pass to wide receiver David Kircus with 1:04 left in the game to lift the Lakers to a 31-24 victory.

In addition to the national championship victory and the second consecutive trip to the national championship game, Grand Valley captured its second consecutive Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference Football Championship with a perfect 9-0 record, and going through the playoffs and concluding the season with a perfect record of 14-0.

Head Coach Brian Kelly, who has been with the team since 1991, has led the team to a 104-34-2 overall record and has much to be proud of. Coach Kelly assembled an extraordinary football program and a stellar coaching staff.

Led by senior quarterback Curt Anes, who on the evening before the championship game was awarded the 2002

Harlon Hill Trophy as Division II Football's most outstanding player, the Grand Valley State Football Team was an example of resiliency and determination as they strived to meet their team goal of a national championship. This triumph was truly a team effort.

Finally, I would like to also offer my thanks and congratulations to the extended family of Grand Valley State University, the alumni, the faculty, the fans, and of course the students who supported this team.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H. Res. 13, congratulating the Grand Valley State University Lakers for winning the NCAA Division II National Football Championship. This national championship is a special moment for Grand Valley State's fans and its university community. It is the school's first national championship in any varsity sport.

This is an outstanding achievement, especially when we consider that Division II football athletes do not have the benefit and publicity garnered by Division I schools. I know that as a fact because one of my sons was an All American Tackle for a Division II school and it was exciting, but they did not get any of the recognition that the Division I schools garnered.

I want to extend my hearty congratulations to Head Coach Brian Kelly, the Grand Valley State community, all of their fans, and most importantly their student athletes. Grand Valley's athletes have certainly performed admirably, and they deserve all the praise that we can give them.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from the State of Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), who also represents a number of Grand Valley State campuses in his district.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and I can only echo the words of congratulation that he has offered.

Just to give a little more information about Grand Valley State University, it did not start until 1960, with 223 students. If they fielded a football team that year, it would have consumed 10 percent of the student body. And in 42 short years, they went from that to a rather large University of 20,000 students, more than 48,000 alumni, and winning the national championship in the NCAA. It is an astounding record.

Also, I might mention that the main campus is in the west Michigan area, represented by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), from whom we just heard; but the downtown campus is in my district. That consists of many graduate studies programs, engineering, and post-graduate course offerings.

It is a remarkable record of success. I have to pay tribute to the former president, Arend (Don) Lubbers, who served from 1968 through 2001 and did an incredible job of taking a fledgling university and building it into a full-grown university. In fact, the football stadium at Grand Valley is named after him, and is called Lubbers Stadium. The current president, Mark Murray, succeeded Lubbers in 2001. He has been there a short time and has done a great job of continuing the work there.

Football and sports are not the be-all and end-all of the university experience, especially in Michigan, where we have a strong orientation towards academic performance. But President Lubbers understood that successful sports teams are a source of pride for the students, staff, administration, and alumni of the schools they represent. In this respect, Grand Valley State University Lakers have ably represented their university and all of west Michigan in their march to the national championship.

The opportunity of playing on national television in the Division II championship game in each of the past two seasons has given Grand Valley State University national exposure it never would have received otherwise. I wish to congratulate the team for their tremendous performance this year. They came within one game of winning the national championship last year. They came back determined to win it this year, and they did.

Congratulations are also due to Coach Brian Kelly, who was named last night as the American Football Coaches Association's Division II National Coach of the Year. He has done an outstanding job there. I also want to congratulate senior quarterback Curt Anes, who received the Harlan Hill Trophy, which is Division II's equivalent of the Heisman Trophy. He is also a First-Team All American.

Senior wide receiver David Kircus, also a First-Team All American, set numerous NCAA Division II and school records throughout his career.

In addition, congratulations are due to offensive lineman Dale Westrick and defensive lineman Keyonta Marshall, both named First-Team All Americans.

Also, I have to congratulate not only the school, not only the team, the coach and the players, but also the supporters of the Grand Valley State University Lakers, who set a conference attendance record. That shows their loyalty and their support for the university and for their sports teams.

So I am very pleased that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) has offered this resolution. I am very pleased to join him in commending Grand Valley State University and their football team for their very, very, very fine performance.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I

would once again like to congratulate the Grand Valley State University Lakers. They have had an awesome year. Today we recognize them and congratulate them for that performance.

Mr. Speaker, as we pass this resolution, I would extend to the President a request that he invite the Grand Valley State University football team to Washington, D.C., to a White House ceremony that the White House traditionally hosts for Division II national championships of all sports; and we look forward to that happening.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the extended Grand Valley State University family.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 13.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H. RES. 13, CONGRATULATING THE GRAND VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY LAKERS FOR WINNING THE 2002 NCAA DIVISION II FOOTBALL NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of House Resolution 13 the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

HONORING WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY FOR WINNING 2002 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 17) honoring the Hilltoppers of Western Kentucky University from Bowling Green, Kentucky, for winning the 2002 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I-AA football championship.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 17

Whereas the Western Kentucky University Hilltoppers from Bowling Green, Kentucky, won the 2002 NCAA Division I-AA collegiate football national championship;

Whereas the national championship is the first for the Western Kentucky University football program since its inception in 1913;

Whereas the Hilltoppers had an impressive overall record of 12 wins and 3 losses during the 2002 season, which included 10 consecutive wins;

Whereas the Hilltoppers showed tremendous dedication to each other, appreciation to their fans, sportsmanship to their opponents, and respect for the game of football throughout their 2002 season;

Whereas Western Kentucky University was represented with integrity and principled leadership under the direction of Head Football Coach Jack Harbaugh, Athletic Director Dr. Wood Selig, and President Dr. Gary A. Ransdell; and

Whereas on December 20, 2002, the Western Kentucky University Hilltoppers, ranked 15th among Division I-AA teams, defeated the top-ranked McNeese State University Cowboys for the 2002 NCAA Division I-AA football championship in Chattanooga, Tennessee, by a score of 34-14: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives honors the Western Kentucky University football team from Bowling Green, Kentucky, for winning the 2002 NCAA Division I-AA football championship.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 17.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, with Western Kentucky University's recent success on the basketball court and the Hilltoppers' first NCAA championship on the football field in 2002, Kentucky is now home to yet another top-ranked college sports program. I am proud to have Western Kentucky University in my district.

We were not in session on December 20 when Western Kentucky won its first Division I-AA football championship, but I wanted to take this opportunity in this session of Congress to acknowledge the team's achievements.

The 15th ranked Hilltoppers defeated top-ranked McNeese State 34-14 in the championship game. Western brought their best game to the playoffs and the championship, defeating the three highest ranked teams on their way to taking the title.

Just as they had all season, the Toppers again relied on their tough defense and strong running game. Jon Frazier rushed for 159 yards and two touchdowns, bringing his season total to 1,537 yards and moving him into second

place in Western's running records. The defense combined for three interceptions and a sack, holding McNeese State below its season scoring average.

In his 14th year at Western Kentucky, Coach Jack Harbaugh saw his and the team's hard work finally pay off. Coach Harbaugh has been committed to the Western football program and has built a successful program that the University, the Bowling Green community and the State should be proud of.

After starting the season with a 2-3 record, including a loss to McNeese State, the Hilltoppers relied on their teamwork and dedication to win 10 straight games, finishing the season with the national championship.

Mr. Speaker, I join Western Kentucky University and all of Bowling Green in congratulating the Hilltopper football team on its national championship season.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 17 congratulating the Hilltoppers of Western Kentucky for winning the 2002 Division I-AA national football championship. It is quite an achievement to win a national championship at any college level, and this championship is even more noteworthy due to the fact that it is Western Kentucky's first national championship since 1913.

Student athletes split their time between their athletic and academic pursuits. The student athletes that make up this year's national championship Hilltoppers' team must be commended because they did such a good job for their dual pursuit. I want to especially congratulate them for all their hard work, and also extend my hardy congratulations to head coach Jack Harbaugh for a great season and great win.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Res. 17 honoring the Hilltoppers of Western Kentucky University from Bowling Green, Kentucky for winning the 2002 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I-AA football championship.

I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), for sponsoring this resolution and congratulate the gentleman for the success this school has had from his district and for his opportunity to represent them in Washington, D.C.

Today the House has recognized the outstanding athletic accomplishment of our Nation's young people. These championships are a testament to the spirit of athletic competition; and, frankly, they are enormous fun to watch. I congratulate all of the athletes and schools who have participated in collegiate athletics, and express my specific congratulations to Western Kentucky University.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 17.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SALARY ADJUSTMENTS FOR JUSTICES AND JUDGES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 16) to authorize salary adjustments for Justices and judges of the United States for fiscal year 2003.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 16

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF SALARY ADJUSTMENTS FOR FEDERAL JUSTICES AND JUDGES.

Pursuant to section 140 of Public Law 97-92, Justices and judges of the United States are authorized during fiscal year 2003 to receive a salary adjustment in accordance with section 461 of title 28, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 16, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation authorizes Federal judges to receive the same cost of living pay adjustment that all Federal employees, including Members of Congress, have received for calendar year 2003.

By way of background, Congress enacted the Executive Salary Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act in 1975, which was intended to give judges, Members of Congress and other high-ranking Executive Branch officials automatic COLAs as accorded other Federal employees unless rejected by Congress. In

1981, Congress enacted section 140 of Public Law 97-92, which requires specific congressional action authorizing judges the COLA.

Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the 107th Congress, we failed to provide a COLA for Federal judges. This constitutes an inequity, since Members of Congress and all other Federal employees did receive a COLA in 2003.

The bill is straightforward. It simply provides for a cost-of-living adjustment for Federal judges consistent with the law. The President and the Chief Justice of the United States support granting judges a COLA now. The bill will assist in the administration of justice in our Federal courts and is otherwise noncontroversial. I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this critical legislation which provides the Federal judiciary with a much-needed cost-of-living adjustment. I also thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) for his leadership on this matter, and the speed with which he has brought this legislation to the House floor.

Article I, Section III of the Constitution provides that the pay of Federal judges "shall not be diminished during their time in office." Unfortunately, by failing to provide Federal judges with annual COLAs over the last decade, they have faced the economic equivalent of a \$77,000 reduction in salary. In the last 30 years, while average pay has increased 12 percent for most workers, it has decreased 25 percent for Federal judges.

Currently, Federal district court judges earn \$150,000 per year. This is far less than they could earn in private practice, and is even less than an associate right out of law school earns in New York City. It has gotten so bad that employees of the Administrative Office of Courts, who work for the Federal judges, now enjoy greater salaries than the judges themselves. This is the equivalent of congressional staff earning more than congressmen and women. It is no wonder that Federal judges are leaving in droves, with nearly six dozen judges leaving over the last several years, and notably with many districts overloaded with cases and many citizens not able to have their grievances addressed. That certainly does not bear well for the Constitution.

There can be no doubt of the value and importance of ensuring that our Federal judges are fairly compensated. The Federal judiciary is the crown jewel of our democracy. If there is any single idea in the Constitution that has separated our experiment in democracy

from all other nations, it is the concept of a free and independent and just judiciary.

The Founding Fathers, in their great wisdom, created a system of checks and balances, granting independent judges not only lifetime tenure, but the right to an undiminished salary. It is no surprise that over the years, the Federal judiciary, more than any other branch, has served as the protector of our precious civil rights and liberties. I agree with Alexander Hamilton that the "independent spirit of judges" enables them to stand against the "ill humors of passing political majorities."

But we cannot have a qualified and independent judiciary if we do not pay them a just wage. Just last week Chief Justice Rehnquist declared that "providing adequate compensation for judges is basic to attracting and retaining experienced, well-qualified and diverse men and women." Justice Breyer was even more blunt when he stated "The gulf that separates judicial pay from compensation in the non-profit sector, in academia, and in the private sector grows larger and larger, and threatens irreparable harm both to the institution and the public it serves."

It is for these reasons that I was so shocked last November when the continuing resolution Congress approved gave a cost-of-living adjustment to nearly every Federal worker but the Federal judges. The bill before us responds to that oversight by granting the judiciary a COLA retroactive to the start of the last fiscal year. I consider this to be a modest downpayment in the development of a more rational and fair system of compensating our Federal judges. I urge an enthusiastic yes vote for this bill.

I rise in support of this critical legislation, which provides the federal judiciary with a much needed cost of living adjustment. I also want to thank Chairman SENSENBRENNER for his leadership on this matter and the speed with which he has brought this legislation to the House floor.

Article I, Section III of the Constitution provides that the pay of federal judges "shall not be diminished during their time in office." Unfortunately, by failing to provide federal judges with annual COLA's over the last decade, they have faced the economic equivalent of a \$77,000 reduction in salary. In the last 30 years, while average pay has increased 12 percent for most workers, it has decreased 25 percent for federal judges.

Currently, federal district court judges earn \$150,000 per year. This is far, far less than they could earn in private practice and is even less than an associate right out of law school earns in New York City.

It has gotten so bad that employees of the Administrative Office of the Courts—who work for the federal judges—now enjoy greater salaries than the judges themselves. This is the equivalent of congressional staff earning more than Congressmen. It is no wonder that federal judges are leaving in droves, with nearly six dozen judges leaving over the last several years.

There can be no doubt of the value and importance of insuring that our federal judges

are fairly compensated. The federal judiciary is the crown jewel of our democracy. If there is any single idea in the Constitution that has separated our experiment in democracy from all other nations, it is the concept of an independent judiciary.

The founding fathers, in their great wisdom, created a system of checks and balances, granting independent judges not only lifetime tenure, but the right to an undiminished salary. It is no surprise that over the years, the federal judiciary, more than any other branch, has served as the protector of our previous civil rights and civil liberties. I agree with Alexander Hamilton that the "independent spirit of judges" enable them to stand against the "ill humors of passing political majorities."

But we cannot have a qualified and independent judiciary if we don't pay them at a just wage. Just last week Chief Justice Rehnquist declared that "providing adequate compensation for judges is basic to attracting and retaining experience, well-qualified and diverse men and women." Justice Breyer was even more blunt when he stated, "the gulf that separates judicial pay from compensation in the non-profit sector, in academia, and in the private sector grows larger and larger . . . and threatens irreparable harm both to the institution and the public it serves."

It is for these reasons that I was so shocked last November when the continuing resolution Congress approved gave a cost of living adjustment to nearly every federal worker but the federal judges. The bill before us responds to that oversight by granting the judiciary a COLA retroactive to the start of the last fiscal year. I consider this to be a modest down payment in developing a more rationale and fair system of compensating our federal judges. I urge a yes vote.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for this legislation to give our Federal judges a cost-of-living adjustment. There is no question that they deserve and need this COLA and more. In 2001, the American Bar Association and the Federal Bar Association released a report detailing a fundamental problem that has escalated over the past decade, the erosion of fair and adequate compensation for the Federal judiciary. These two well-respected groups issued this report because they found that the current salaries of Federal judges have reached such levels of inadequacy that, and I quote, "they threaten to impair the quality and independence of the third branch."

Yes, it is true that Federal judges earn a higher salary than many Americans, but it is also true that in many cases a first-year associate at law firm earns considerably more than does a judge. I think that all of us would agree that public service has its own rewards, but those rewards do not pay the bills.

Members may wonder why it is that we must take up this legislation to authorize a COLA for Federal judges. The short answer is that we should not have to do so. But because of a provision enacted back in 1981, every year, year in and year out, Congress must authorize the COLAs of Federal judges even though those COLAs are the very same COLAs that are automatically granted to Members of Congress and senior executive branch employees. It is inefficient and it is unfair to make judges scale this additional hurdle. That is why I soon will introduce legislation that puts judges back on the same track as Congress and senior members of the executive branch, automatic COLAs, unless Congress specifically votes against it.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. Let us give our judges the pay they deserve, and let us eliminate the provision that requires us to take this action each year.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we all come from different congressional districts, but we are honored and cherish the right to represent Americans. I happen to come from a district with a sizable population of Hispanic Americans, African Americans and Asian Americans, a very diverse community.

In paying tribute to the Federal judiciary, might I make note of the fact that it is the Federal judiciary that most often has been able to create opportunities for groups who have felt disenfranchised and left out. It is the Federal judiciary that responded favorably in the Sixth Circuit on the positive aspects of affirmative action, recognizing that affirmative action is not a handout but a hand-up, and affirmatively approved the affirmative action program at the State university, the University of Michigan, allowing for that campus to have a diverse student body.

In particular, I happen to come from what is defined as a voter rights district, established under the Voter Rights Act of 1965. Since the creation of that district, held first by the Honorable Barbara Jordan, we have been in court over the years time after time. In the times that we have been in courts, it has been the Federal courts that have reaffirmed the value of having congressional districts that are able to give one-vote/one-person and provide the opportunities for, in this instance, minorities, African Americans and Hispanics, to vote for the person of their choosing, some now call it communities of interest, and to allow them to have a voice in the United States Congress. It has been the Federal courts that have heard these cases over and over and in many instances the Federal judiciary that has risen above their political persuasions and have offered opportunity and hope to my constituents.

Likewise, when there have been cases of discrimination, we have been most

gratified that it has been the Federal courts that have taken these cases and responded, on sexual discrimination, age discrimination, race discrimination; and for many Americans, this would be the only way that they would be able to seek opportunity and to address their grievances.

I believe this vital role that the third branch of government plays should be so noted when we cavalierly miss them, if you will, in compensation. This is a time to appreciate the very important role that they play in bringing justice to America. As I conclude my remarks, might I say that that is why so many of us play a role in the process of nominations and why we so vigorously fight in the struggle, if you will, for designing a Federal court judiciary that is truly reflective of all of America.

With that, I would say that I hope that my colleagues in the comments that I have made will reflect upon the high importance of the judiciary that is a key part of the democracy of this Nation, and I would ask my colleagues to enthusiastically both respect, admire, and support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I think at this point in the debate, it is proper to give a little history of how judicial salaries have been set. The last time Congress visited the whole issue of executive, legislative, and judicial salaries was in the Ethics Reform Act in 1989. Prior to 1989, there was a quadrennial commission that met every 4 years to decide what would be fair compensation for Federal judges, Members of Congress, and senior members of the executive branch, except the President whose salary was set through another process. This commission, which was comprised of people outside government, always recommended that there be significant pay raises for all of the officials covered in the old law. The pay raises were so significant that there was a huge public outcry, and Congress ended up rejecting those recommendations almost uniformly because of pressure from our constituency.

So in 1989 when Congress passed the Ethics Reform Act, it abolished the quadrennial commission, and it replaced it with a citizens' commission on public service and compensation. That was 14 years ago, and the new commission has never met. This same law stated that the salaries of the district judges would be the same as salaries of Members of Congress, and there has been a linkage of the district judges' salaries and that paid United States Senators and United States Representatives since. So as our salaries have gone up through cost-of-living increases, the judicial salaries have also gone up; and it was usually because there was a provision put in an appropriations bill that gave the judges the same COLA as Members of Congress and executive branch officials.

I know every year the Chief Justice talks about the inequity in pay of Federal judges and those who practice before them. I think he has a very valid point. But the points that the Chief Justice makes miss the point of the 1989 law completely; and I think that if we are talking about a judicial pay raise, it is incumbent upon those who are supporting it, which is not me at this time, to answer two questions: What should be the compensation of district judges, appeals judges, and justices of the Supreme Court of the United States? And why are the responsibilities of the Federal judiciary so much more than the responsibilities of United States Senators and United States Representatives that they deserve to be paid out of the taxpayers' treasury a considerably higher pay than the Senators and the Representatives, which I think have at least equal and probably much greater responsibilities on a day-to-day basis than members of the Federal judiciary have.

The burden of proof, to use a judicial term, on why the judicial salaries should be delinked from the legislative and executive branch salaries is on the Federal judiciary and those who advocate such a delinkage. In none of the statements that I have seen from the advocates of higher judicial salaries has there been one argument in favor of why these salaries should be delinked.

Because the Congress last fall failed to pass the same COLA as Members of Congress and the executive branch received, this bill is fair, this bill is necessary, and this bill should be supported. But until we get answers to the other two issues that I have raised, I do not think we should amend the basic law that was passed in the Ethics Reform Act of 1989.

I urge the House to pass this bill.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I support this measure to give Federal Judges a cost-of-living adjustment.

Just today, the Washington Post reported the findings of a non-partisan National Commission on the Public Service, led by former Federal Reserve chairman Paul A. Volker.

One of the first steps the Commission recommends is to give federal judges an "immediate and significant" increase in pay.

As it is, judges make far less than they could earn in private firms, and there is certainly no monetary incentive for top lawyers to accept nomination to the Federal judiciary.

Though there is prestige in serving as a Federal judge, many of this country's best lawyers simply cannot justify leaving private practice during their prime earning years to serve on the bench.

In the long run, this phenomenon will affect the quality of people we can attract to serve as federal judges. It doesn't mean that we ought to be matching partner bonuses dollar-for-dollar, but it does mean that we have to consider what the private sector offers if we want to ask our best and brightest to become public servants.

Though a 3.1 percent COLA may not be all that "significant," it is a small step toward creating enough incentive for Judges to remain on the Bench.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 16, which authorizes salary adjustments for the federal judiciary during fiscal year 2003.

Before the 107th Congress adjourned sine die, the House failed to authorize a necessary pay adjustment for the federal judiciary. The continuing resolution that the House passed on November 13, 2002, did not include the 3.1 percent cost-of-living adjustment for FY 2003 that federal judges were supposed to have received on January 1, 2003. The Ethics Reform Act of 1989 assures federal judges an annual adjustment based upon the Employment Cost Index [ECI], and Congress's failure to live up to its promise under that Act could have dire consequences for our legal system.

It is imperative that Congress takes every action necessary to ensure the viability of the federal judiciary. In his 2001 Year-End Report on the Federal Judiciary, Supreme Court Chief Justice William Rehnquist stressed the importance of annual pay adjustments and requested that Congress increase salaries as a means of attracting and retaining qualified judges. Federal judicial salaries are relatively small compared to the salaries that are earned by experienced attorneys in private practice. Relatively low judicial pay, combined with a complicated and lengthy judicial confirmation process, acts as a disincentive for qualified, dedicated attorneys to join the federal judiciary. When judicial vacancies go unfilled, the American legal system suffers.

It is inexcusable that the House failed to pass the FY 2003 Commerce, Justice and State appropriations bill, which contains the necessary authorization and appropriation for a federal judicial pay adjustment, during the 107th Congress. While Congress managed to give itself a pay raise for the current fiscal year, the federal judiciary was hung out to dry. Mr. Speaker, our system of justice is among the best in the world, and as the peoples' representatives, we should do all that we can to ensure the future viability of the judiciary. I am pleased that the House has finally considered this long-overdue legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this critical legislation, of which I am an original cosponsor. This bill provides the federal judiciary with a much needed cost of living adjustment (COLA) for their salary. I also would like to thank Chairman SENSENBRENNER for his leadership and bipartisanship on this issue.

The Constitution mandates that the pay of federal judges "shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office." Unfortunately, by failing to provide judges with annual COLA's over the last decade, they have faced the equivalent of a \$77,000 reduction in salary. Currently, federal district court judges earn \$150,000 per year. This is much less than they could earn in private practice; in fact, it is less than an attorney right out of law school can earn in private practice. Even the judges' employees, those who work at the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts make more than their employers. In the last 30 years, while average pay has increased 12 percent for most workers, it had decreased 25 percent for federal judges.

This issue can seem to be just a matter of salary, but it extends deeply into our concept

of a democracy and judicial independence. The Constitution establishes a system of checks and balances, granting independent judges lifetime tenure and the right to an undiminished salary, in order to ensure the judiciary remains independent of financial, political, and social pressures. Unfortunately, many federal judges are leaving the bench for private practice, and many experienced and qualified private practitioners are deterred from serving in the judiciary. The pay disparity has diminished the independence of our third branch and made it difficult to attract and retain qualified attorneys.

This is why I was surprised when the continuing resolution Congress approved last session gave a cost of living adjustment to most federal employees except judges. The bill before us remedies this oversight by authorizing a COLA for the judiciary that is retroactive to the start of the 2003 fiscal year.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 16.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1740

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER) at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1850

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER) at 6 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 95, nays 315, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Hill	Pallone
Allen	Hinchey	Pastor
Andrews	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Bell	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)
Berman	(TX)	Rangel
Berry	Jefferson	Rodriguez
Bishop (GA)	John	Ross
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman
Brown, Corrine	Jones (OH)	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Kaptur	Sabo
Cardoza	Kennedy (RI)	Sanchez, Loretta
Carson (IN)	Kleczka	Sanders
Clay	Lampson	Sandlin
Clyburn	Langevin	Schakowsky
Cooper	Lantos	Scott (GA)
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Skelton
Cummings	Lee	Slaughter
Davis (AL)	Lowey	Stark
Davis (TN)	Lynch	Stenholm
DeFazio	Maloney	Tauscher
Delahunt	Markey	Taylor (MS)
DeLauro	Marshall	Thompson (CA)
Deutsch	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Meehan	Tierney
Doggett	Menendez	Van Hollen
Emanuel	Millender-McDonald	Velazquez
Evans	Miller, George	Waters
Farr	Neal (MA)	Watson
Filner	Oberstar	Wexler
Frank (MA)	Obey	Woolsey
Frost	Olver	Wynn
Grijalva	Owens	
Hastings (FL)		

NAYS—315

Abercrombie	Brown-Waite,	Deal (GA)
Aderholt	Ginny	DeGette
Akin	Burgess	DeLay
Baca	Burns	DeMint
Bachus	Burr	Diaz-Balart, L.
Baker	Burton (IN)	Diaz-Balart, M.
Baldwin	Buyer	Dicks
Barrett (SC)	Calvert	Dooley (CA)
Bartlett (MD)	Camp	Doolittle
Barton (TX)	Cannon	Doyle
Bass	Cantor	Dreier
Beauprez	Capito	Duncan
Becerra	Capps	Dunn
Bereuter	Carson (OK)	Edwards
Berkley	Carter	Ehlers
Biggert	Case	Emerson
Bilirakis	Castle	Engel
Bishop (NY)	Chabot	English
Bishop (UT)	Chocola	Eshoo
Blackburn	Coble	Etheridge
Blumenauer	Cole	Everett
Blunt	Collins	Fattah
Boehlert	Combest	Feeney
Boehner	Costello	Ferguson
Bonilla	Cox	Flake
Bonner	Cramer	Fletcher
Bono	Crane	Foley
Boozman	Crenshaw	Forbes
Boswell	Cubin	Ford
Boyd	Culberson	Fossella
Bradley (NH)	Cunningham	Franks (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Frelinghuysen
Brady (TX)	Davis (FL)	Galleghy
Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)	Garrett (NJ)
Brown (SC)	Davis, Jo Ann	Gephardt
	Davis, Tom	Gerlach

Gibbons	Lucas (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Gilchrist	Lucas (OK)	Royce
Gingrey	Majette	Ruppersberger
Gonzalez	Manzullo	Ryan (OH)
Goode	Matheson	Ryan (WI)
Goodlatte	Matsui	Ryun (KS)
Gordon	McCarthy (MO)	Sanchez, Linda
Goss	McCarthy (NY)	T.
Granger	McCollum	Saxton
Graves	McCotter	Schiff
Green (TX)	McHugh	Schrock
Green (WI)	McInnis	Scott (VA)
Greenwood	McIntyre	Sensenbrenner
Gutknecht	McKeon	Serrano
Hall	McNulty	Sessions
Harman	Meek (FL)	Shadegg
Harris	Meeks (NY)	Shaw
Hart	Mica	Shays
Hastings (WA)	Michaud	Sherman
Hayes	Miller (FL)	Sherwood
Hefley	Miller (MI)	Shimkus
Hensarling	Miller, Gary	Shuster
Hinojosa	Mollohan	Simmons
Hobson	Moore	Simpson
Hoeffel	Moran (KS)	Smith (MI)
Hoekstra	Moran (VA)	Smith (NJ)
Holden	Murphy	Smith (TX)
Holt	Murtha	Smith (WA)
Honda	Musgrave	Snyder
Hostettler	Myrick	Solis
Houghton	Nadler	Souder
Hoyer	Napolitano	Spratt
Hulshof	Ney	Stearns
Hunter	Northup	Strickland
Hyde	Norwood	Stupak
Inslee	Nunes	Sullivan
Isakson	Nussle	Sweeney
Israel	Ortiz	Tancredo
Issa	Osborne	Tanner
Istook	Ose	Tauzin
Jenkins	Otter	Taylor (NC)
Johnson (CT)	Pascarell	Terry
Johnson (IL)	Paul	Thomas
Johnson, Sam	Pearce	Thornberry
Jones (NC)	Pence	Tiahrt
Kanjorski	Peterson (PA)	Tiberi
Keller	Petri	Toomey
Kelly	Pickering	Turner (OH)
Kennedy (MN)	Pitts	Turner (TX)
Kildee	Platts	Udall (CO)
King (IA)	Pombo	Udall (NM)
King (NY)	Pomeroy	Upton
Kingston	Porter	Visclosky
Kirk	Portman	Vitter
Kline	Price (NC)	Walden (OR)
Knollenberg	Pryce (OH)	Walsh
Kolbe	Putnam	Wamp
Kucinich	Quinn	Watt
LaHood	Radanovich	Waxman
Larsen (WA)	Rahall	Weiner
Latham	Ramstad	Weldon (FL)
LaTourette	Regula	Weller
Leach	Rehberg	Whitfield
Levin	Renzi	Wicker
Lewis (CA)	Reyes	Wilson (NM)
Lewis (GA)	Reynolds	Wilson (SC)
Lewis (KY)	Rogers (AL)	Wolf
Linder	Rogers (KY)	Wu
LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)	Young (AK)
Lofgren	Rohrabacher	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—23

Ackerman	Hayworth	Miller (NC)
Baird	Herger	Nethercutt
Ballance	Janklow	Oxley
Ballenger	Kilpatrick	Payne
Cardin	Kind	Rush
Conyers	Lipinski	Towns
Gillmor	McCrery	Weldon (PA)
Gutierrez	McDermott	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BE-REUTER) (during the vote). The Chair would advise Members that there is approximately 2 minutes remaining on the 15 minute clock.

□ 1912

Mr. ETHERIDGE and Mr. MEEK of Florida changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. TIERNEY changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 1 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BE-REUTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 15, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of H.J. Res. 1 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 1

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 107-229 is further amended by striking the date specified in section 107(c) and inserting in lieu thereof “January 31, 2003”.

SEC. 2. Public Law 107-229, as amended, is further amended in section 120, by striking “and December 1, 2002,” and inserting “December 1, 2002, January 31, 2003, and February 1, 2003.”

SEC. 3. Section 613 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2002, is amended (1) by striking “2001” and “2002” each place it appears and inserting “2002” and “2003”, respectively; and (2) in subsection (a)(1), as so amended, by inserting “(as if effect on September 30, 2002)” after “Act, 2002” and after “such section 613”: *Provided*, That such section, as so amended, shall be effective through September 30, 2003, notwithstanding section 107 of this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. Public Law 107-229, as amended, is further amended by striking section 137 and inserting the following new section:

“SEC. 137. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, in addition to amounts made available in section 101, and subject to sections 107(c) and 108, such sums as may be necessary shall be available to the Securities and Exchange Commission for the Secretary of the Treasury to advance start-up expenses to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board pursuant to section 109(j) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-204).

“(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, upon the collection of fees authorized in section 109(d) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-204), the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board shall reimburse the Securities and Exchange Commission for any Commission appropriations advanced to the Board for start-up expenses pursuant to section 109(j) of such Act or subsection (a) of this section, so as to result in no net effect of such advances on appropriations available to the Commission in fiscal year 2003.”

SEC. 5. (a) APPROVAL OF PROSPECTUS.—For proposes of section 3307(a) of title 40, United

States Code, the prospectus of General Services Administration entitled “Prospectus—Lease, Department of Homeland Security, Washington, DC Metropolitan Area”, prospectus number PDC-08W03, as submitted on December 24, 2002, is deemed approved by the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) PROHIBITION ON DELEGATION.—The authority of the General Services Administration to lease space under this section may not be delegated to any other department or agency.

(c) MODIFICATIONS.—Any modification to the prospectus referred to in subsection (a) that is subject to approval under section 3307 of title 40, United States Code, shall be approved in accordance with the requirements of such section.

SEC. 6. Section 126 of Public Law 107-229, as added by Public Law 107-240, is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 126. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 107, the District of Columbia may expend local funds for programs and activities under the heading ‘District of Columbia Funds—Operating Expenses’ at the rate set forth for such programs and activities in the revised financial plan and budget for the District Government for fiscal year 2003 submitted to Congress by the District of Columbia pursuant to section 138 of H.R. 5521 of the 107th Congress, as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 15, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before the House, H.J. Res. 1, will extend the current continuing resolution to allow the government to continue to operate through January 31 of 2003. All of the ongoing programs and activities will be continued at current rates under the same terms and conditions as fiscal year 2002, with the exception of funding for programs included in the Defense and Military Construction appropriations bills for fiscal year 2003, which have already been enacted into law.

In addition, all the provisions of the previous CRs remain in effect, with one exception: It deletes a provision relating to the rate of operations for the Federal-aid Highways Program that had been enacted as part of the third continuing resolution. Specifically, that CR established total obligations for the highway program while operating under continuing resolutions. Section 4 of this resolution deletes that provision, and Mr. Speaker, it does so with the concurrence of the transportation and infrastructure authorizing committee.

I want everyone to understand this action is going to affect the budget. We have been advised by the Congressional Budget Office that it will score an additional \$1.1 billion in outlays on an

annualized basis against this continuing resolution as a result of that deletion. So we are upping the price, but this was an agreed arrangement. So that is what we are going to do.

The CR also includes five new provisions. I will briefly explain what they are.

Number 1, it will extend the authorities necessary to make entitlement payments to include the Child Nutrition Programs, the Food Stamps Program, Medicaid grants to States, payments to Medicare trust funds, Trade Adjustment Assistance Programs, veterans entitlements and supplemental security income payments through the month of February.

Number 2, it will maintain the annual blue collar worker pay adjustment to be consistent with other Federal pay increases.

Number 3, it will allow for funding for the Public Companies Accounting Oversight Board as established in the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, Public Law 107-204.

Number 4, it will allow the District of Columbia to spend local funds at the revised budget levels for fiscal year 2003.

Number 5, it will allow the Administrator of General Services to move forward on the GSA prospectus to lease space for the headquarters of the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. Speaker, we are beginning a new year and a new Congress. We need to get the business of the old Congress behind us. We will explain at a later date how we plan to do this, but this CR gives us time to put that plan into effect.

I do not think this CR is controversial. I am not aware of any controversy. I urge the House to move this legislation to the Senate and then to the President so that there will be no question that the government will continue to operate smoothly and efficiently through January 31.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening here is that this is the first of two continuing resolutions which the House is going to endeavor to pass tonight. The first is simply a vehicle by which we keep the government open for the next 30 days or so, while the Congress at long last gets about the business of finishing what it should have done last year; namely, virtually all of the domestic appropriation bills.

The second continuing resolution that will be voted on after this one will be an empty vehicle which is sent to the Senate, and the Senate will then use that as the carrying vehicle for the work that they do to put together all of the remaining appropriation bills.

As I was saying, the Senate will then proceed to work its will on the remaining domestic appropriation bills. They will then put them together in one package in the second CR, which we

will send over, and they will come back to the House for an up or down vote as a conference report. That effectively means that the House will have been shielded from any responsibility to take visible positions on virtually all of the issues involved in education, in health care, in the Labor Department programs, in housing programs, in science programs, foreign aid, you name it. That, I believe, is the purpose of this process.

I do not happen to think that is a very healthy process but that is what the plan is. What that means is that tonight represented the only opportunity for Members of this body to speak to any of the issues that would be funded by this continuing resolution.

Now, the rules of the House provide that if the Committee on Appropriations has not passed a new 302(b) allocation, allocating the total resources of the committee that are available to us to the various subcommittees, then the House is precluded from considering an appropriation bill. So last night the Committee on Rules waived that provision for the majority so that the majority is able to proceed with this process today, but they refused to waive it for the minority, which means that we cannot offer any significant or meaningful amendments to the continuing resolution.

If we had not been denied that right, we wanted to offer a \$5 billion package that essentially asked the House to, once again, approve matters which it approved in the supplemental last summer. Half of that would be the \$2.5 billion that we provided for additional homeland security items, additional port protection, additional border protection, additional support to the FBI to modernize its computer system, additional translators and the like. All of that money has already been voted for by 90 percent of the Members of both parties in this House, but it has been effectively impounded by the President who declined to spend that \$2.5 billion, thus leaving this country needlessly exposed on the homeland security front.

The other \$2 billion or so that we wanted to add represented other items that the House had already voted for: The \$274 million which was badly needed for veterans medical care to clean up the backlog at veterans facilities; the \$401 million which was necessary to provide aid to first responders, our police and our firemen at the local level; and \$200 million to assist with anti-terrorist actions on the part of the State of Israel, for instance, all of that has been denied us because the House Committee on Rules essentially said that there should be one set of rules for the majority and another set of rules for the minority.

Now, as I said earlier today on the floor, the purpose of rules in any venue is to see to it that all people are treated the same, and that is true whether you are talking about a San Francisco 49er and New York Giant football game

or whether you are talking about actions on the floor of the House. We are supposed to have rules that apply equally to everybody, but thanks to the misguided and misbegotten action of the Committee on Rules that is not what we are going to have.

So what that means is that this House, which is supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world, has been turned into something that much more clearly represents a Soviet Congress than it represents the embodiment of democratic representation.

What this means is that a small group of insider Members in the Republican leadership have essentially decided ahead of time what the outcome should be on all of these appropriation bills, and now they have fixed the process so that there is no practical possibility whatsoever of changing in any way that desired outcome. That may be an effective use of power, but it is a fundamental corruption of the legislative process that goes to the heart of democratic government, and people who engage in that kind of conduct, in my view, should be ashamed of themselves.

So what we are faced with is the necessity to try to use extraordinary means in order to try to gain some ability to define what actions we on this side of the aisle believe are in the best interests of the country. Mr. Speaker, I detest the idea of having to go after House traditions and normal House procedures. I do not like, for instance, to have to try to appeal the ruling of the Chair on matters, but when we are denied the legitimate exercise of our rights to define differences, which is supposed to be the subject of legislative debate, then we are left with no choice but to engage in extraordinary measures as a matter of protest.

Now, we have not created this situation. The House Republican leadership and the House Committee on Rules has. I would urge them to reconsider.

Yesterday, we heard all kinds of nice words about bipartisanship. The Speaker said that we should respect each other. We do not feel that much respect has been shown this institution when the normal processes of this institution are cut short for the partisan convenience of the party that happens to control this House.

□ 1930

So I wanted to explain why it is that we on this side of the aisle are unhappy and why we will be doing what we are doing tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. The gentleman

from Wisconsin has given us an explanation with reference to what is transpiring.

When I came to this body, I had no idea that I would have the privilege to serve on the Committee on Rules. When I was given that opportunity, it became the proudest moment in my limited congressional career. Last night, before we left here, I became rather distressed that the majority does not see fit to grant the minority privileges that the minority at another point in time argued that they should have, I remember very distinctly.

I have great respect for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Certainly, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is a friend of mine, and I have immense respect for him, his fairness and his ability. But the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is not the person that is in control of the situation with reference to the rule. The chairman of the Committee on Rules also is a friend of mine, and I am not certain that he is in control of what is transpiring with reference to the rule.

What is happening here is we are giving back-room deals new meaning. In essence, what my colleagues have done, if we were to take 10 people, as one Member of Congress here said today, she described it as though we had 10 people and my colleagues put a gag on four and a half of them, so that nearly one-half of America is being denied an opportunity to go forward and put ideas on the table for this body to work its will. That is not fair.

Thus my colleagues will find that there are some of us who, different than the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) described when he said we are unhappy, some of us are outraged and plain mad about the circumstances we find ourselves in. In fact, what my colleagues are allowing with these two continuing resolutions is absolutely no debate of consequence with reference to matters of immense and enormous magnitude for the good of this country.

Among the things that we say all the time, and on yesterday proudly all of us admired, as we do admire the Speaker of the House, when he cited certain portions of the Constitution that all of us know so well, among those things was to promote the general welfare. Well, we cannot promote the general welfare with dynamic scoring when we are hiding the deficit with creative math. We cannot promote the general welfare when we find ourselves taking "Jefferson's Manual on Parliamentary Procedure" and pitching it into the Potomac River.

We did not have hearings last night. A train hit those of us in the minority in the Committee on Rules, and a train is hitting every member of the minority as well as the majority. My colleagues hurt themselves as much as they hurt us when they do not give us an opportunity to make an adequate presentation on matters of health, on matters of education, on matters of

homeland security; and I could go on and on.

Everybody knows what my colleagues did when they took over the House of Representatives, and they did it by arguing against what the Democrats did that was so wrong then: closed rules. Yet every time we look up, all we see is no opportunity for amendments, no opportunity for supplementals. Nothing in the way of decency is coming forward. I am outraged.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute just to say that I am not going to try to respond to all the political comments that are going to be made here this evening. I understand the minority is upset. They are upset because they are the minority, and I know about that. I served in this House for 24 years under their rule.

And if my colleagues think what our party is doing tonight to manage the business of the House is something wrong, they should go back and look over the 40 years of their own rule. We had more closed rules, we had more autocratic management of this House, we had more weird crazy, creative schemes to get through the legislative process. And, yes, we complained, just like they are complaining tonight.

But we have to get this job done. Come on. We are already beginning to get ready for our 2004 business. We need to get the 2003 business finished. Like I have suggested on other occasions, let us do our politicking somewhere else. Let us do the people's business here tonight. Let us get this CR out of here.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are not objecting to this process tonight because we are unhappy we are in the minority. We are in the minority, and we expect to lose 99 percent of the votes around here. But we do not expect to have denied to us the opportunity to at least engage in the debate.

My question is, what is the majority party afraid of? Our colleagues in the majority have the votes, and if they think we are wrong, outvote us. But the Committee on Rules has taken us beyond that. What the Committee on Rules has done is that they have said, "Sorry, we are not going to even allow an opportunity to raise any of these questions."

Now, this issue came up in March of 1999 when the Republicans were also in control. The exact same situation arose. At that time the majority party did the right thing. The Republican Party waived the rule for the majority so that we could proceed, but they also waived the rule so that we could participate equally in the process. That is what the majority party should have done this time around. They should have followed their own earlier example.

I would also say that, in effect, what is happening is that the minority party

is being prevented from doing its job because the majority party neglected to pass a 302 allocation. We did not make the determination on this side that that would not happen; the majority party did. So the minority party is being penalized for the inaction of the majority party. That is quaint in any legislative body.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, as a parent of two small children, I have been told that children pay more attention to what their parents do than what we say. Tonight, I hope the American people will use that commonsense principle in judging Congress. It is not what we say in our speeches that counts so much, but far more important to the American people is what we do.

What has this Congress, what has this House done today? Basically, the Republican leadership has denied the minority an opportunity to present an amendment that would have added \$275 million desperately needed in veterans health care. These particular dollars were focused to try to help those veterans who have such critical health care problems that they need specialist care. This \$275 million was designed so that veterans who fought for our country so valiantly, so patriotically would not have to wait 6 months for a heart specialist or for some sort of very, very important care.

I would imagine Republicans and Democrats alike on Veterans Day back home go make that speech, that it is wrong for veterans to have to wait 6 months to get the care that they have earned and even fought for, even been wounded to earn. Yet when we have a chance to do something about it, the Committee on Rules, not through the leadership of either the chairmen or the subcommittee chairmen, who are valiant supporters of veterans health care, but through the actions of the Republican leadership in the House, despite all of our great words on Veterans Day and Memorial Day, all our respect for veterans, when we could do something about it tonight, when we could have helped veterans, what are our actions? We are prevented from even having a vote on helping to improve veterans health care in that desperately needed way.

The Republican leadership does not hurt the Democrats when they deny us the right to such a vote, denying Republicans and Democrats the right to that vote. They hurt veterans. These are men and women who fought for this country, men and women who have been willing to die for this country.

So I wish the Republican leadership would reconsider its ill-founded rule that denies not us but veterans the right to get better health care. Let the American people and let veterans know what we parents of small children

know: it is what we do that counts, not what we say that counts.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time and congratulate my chairman, as always, for trying to do the best job he possibly can under the circumstances and the facts that he is dealing with.

I do not speak in my capacity as whip but as I guess still the ranking member of the Treasury, Postal committee, or whatever capacity I am in, because we have not reconstituted that committee. Mr. Speaker, in the Treasury, Postal committee we included a number of dollars in the supplemental, which would be the subject of the amendment that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) speaks of and that we would like to offer and we think is critical.

First of all, there was \$400 million in there for the emergency first responders. That is a critical figure. All of us are for that. I do not think anybody is opposed to that. As a matter of fact, all of us were for all the dollars that were in this bill. We voted on it, passed it, and it was sequestered by the President. We believe that it is undermining homeland security not to move ahead with these finances at this point in time.

And not only the \$400 million for first responders, but I was at the White House today with the leadership and brought up the funding of the election reform bill. The election reform bill was the most significant bipartisan success that we had in the 107th Congress. The chairman was a very important part of passing that and committing ourselves to funding that election reform legislation to make sure that every American vote not only is cast but is counted accurately. There was \$400 million in that bill for that objective.

The President agreed today that we ought to fund that. Mitchell Daniels agreed we ought to fund it. I do not say they were for this particular amendment, but they believe that funding is appropriate funding. As a matter of fact, I am hopeful and believe that we will get a higher figure.

In this amendment was \$28.5 million for the Secret Service to support the increased cost to protective details and to implement provisions of the PATRIOT Act we passed to secure our homeland. But it needs funding. This \$28.5 million would be in that request.

In addition, there were \$39 million for the Customs Service Container Security initiative. We have heard recently the vulnerability of our ports and the infrastructure in our ports to boats, ships coming into our ports that may be laden with explosives. Customs needs to have additional resources in order to check this. I do not think anybody disagrees with that proposition. However, it has languished unfunded.

Mr. Speaker, because my time is short, let me mention also, and lastly, \$16 million in the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, FLETC, located in Glynco, Georgia. All of us know as a result of the tragedy of 9-11 of the outrage that was committed against this country, that we have made a determination that we are going to upgrade the security of our homeland. One of the ways we are doing that is adding Federal security officers. We are adding them at our airports, we are adding them at our Federal buildings, we are adding them in other places in our Federal infrastructure. We need to train them.

□ 1945

This was not anticipated. The demands for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center have, therefore, been substantially increased. But we have not given them the resources to accomplish that training. In doing so, we undermine homeland security. What we are saying is we ought not to wait. We ought to act, and we ought to act now to protect the homeland security.

It is very nice for us to pass bills and say we want to do this. But if we do not fund it, we cannot do it. We are going to be talking about that at the end of this month. I would hope to find a way to allow this amendment to be offered and that we could pass this amendment overwhelmingly because I believe the objectives are supported.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) was speaking directly to the issue of the CR and to the issue of the necessary funding, and especially for homeland security. The gentleman is correct. In the supplemental that we presented, we covered most of those items that the gentleman mentioned. The President chose not to release some of those funds, and that was the authority that the President had.

What I would say to the gentleman is my support for those issues is no less today than when we did the supplemental. We are in a procedural situation today. We need to get the CR so we can extend past January 11, which is the present CR, and we have to get the second CR which the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has mentioned so we can conclude our work of the 107th Congress.

A lot of Members are congratulating each other in starting out the 108th Congress. My comment to some of my colleagues is I am still trying to get out of the 107th Congress. That is what we need to do tonight. Let us finish the business of the 107th Congress, and then we will get on and take care of the issues that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has so properly identified.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, such as NASA.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership and also the distinguished ranking member for the gentleman's hard work.

Mr. Speaker, we had the opportunity to debate all of these issues at the subcommittee level, at the full committee level, and in many cases on the floor. But all of these items have been debated.

It has been stated that there has not been time for debate, but there has been. We have spent hours and hours and hours. We spent 2½ months in our subcommittee putting this very, very complex bill together, the VA-HUD bill. If we could move forward and pass this and then get to a point where we can pass all of the fiscal year 2003 appropriations bills, that would be a good thing.

There has been discussion about veterans. We have substantial increases in veterans' health care benefits in the 2003 bill. We cannot get to those until we pass this continuing resolution and send a bill to the Senate. We cannot make the increases in the housing accounts for the homeless, in housing for people with AIDS, in the section 8 program, in the senior housing programs. We cannot get those funding measures to the department heads and the money to the department heads to implement those policies if we do not pass this bill.

So there has been plenty of time to debate all of the policy issues. We are at a point where we need to bring closure to the 2003 year. I know I have and the other subcommittee chairmen have a lot of work to do. As soon as we complete on these 2003 bills, I will begin hearings for the Veterans Administration, for HUD, for NASA, for FEMA, for the EPA, for the National Science Foundation. There is a tremendous amount of work to be done, and every minute of every day, every hour that we delay here puts our decisions off for the future, and those are critical decisions.

Advocates are coming to us, veterans are coming to us, people from the science community are coming to us and saying please get these bills done so we can begin to plan for next year's bills. If we work very closely with OMB and the House and the Senate work closely together, we will have a budget resolution to work with. That is what happened this year. The House did its job. We passed our budget resolution. The Senate did not. Had they passed a budget resolution, we could have worked out the differences and had a road map to work with. But we did not have that road map. That is why we are at this juncture.

We need to get this work out of the way, get the bills passed, complete our work on 2003 and get a good solid budget resolution passed for 2004 and get these appropriations bills done. It is not that difficult. It is not rocket science, but we need to get last year's work out of the way first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BE-REUTER). The gentleman from Florida

(Mr. YOUNG) has 9 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 21 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution which I think instead ought to be called this continuing saga of one budget's lonely effort to struggle into maturity is in part a continuing story of the majority's refusal to allow the corporate responsibility bill to go forward. There is some language in here finally that would allow the Public Company Accounting Board to get a couple million dollars in advance from the Treasury. That comes several months late after a couple of unsuccessful efforts that we made; finally the committee has done this.

But on the committee point of funding the corporate responsibility bill known as the Sarbanes-Oxley bill, this continuing resolution continues to refuse to do that. When the President signed the bill with great fanfare months ago, it called for an authorization of \$776 million. This bill has in fact a lower figure than the original budget request as amended, and even if we throw in the pay parity, the appropriations level in this bill, as I last saw it, is more than \$200 million less than Sarbanes-Oxley called for. That is \$540 million instead of \$776 million.

So the President signs the bill with great fanfare, and then refuses to fund it. The Securities and Exchange Commission was given a great number of new responsibilities, and none of them are effectively funded in this bill.

The bill also will continue a situation in which public housing authorities are in crisis. Public housing authorities were told by the Republican Party that when they lost the money for the drug elimination program that had been a specific amount, \$300 million, not to worry. When the majority eliminated the drug elimination program, quite surprisingly to me, which made funds available to housing authorities to combat drug abuses in the housing projects by hiring police and other ways, they were told that is okay, they could fund this out of their regular, ongoing operation.

But this bill, this procedure, has shorted those housing authorities. So they, in the first place, lose the \$300 million for the drug elimination program, and now they are given less money than they needed even without that \$300 million, and already because of the stop and go and interruptions of the continuing resolution and some mistakes on the part of HUD, public housing authorities all over this country are going to be short of money. Elderly people are going to be looking for police protection and maintenance, and people are going to be looking for a whole range of basic protections and they will not be there because of the majority's handling of this matter.

So with regards to both Sarbanes-Oxley and public housing, this bill is sorely deficient.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal and General Government.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is always good in exchanges like this that every once in a while we try to come back to reality and discuss what the topic for debate actually is.

What we have under consideration is a continuing resolution so that the Federal Government can stay open through the end of January, so that people who are expecting some sort of Federal benefit, whether it be a Social Security check, whether it is the continuation of Medicare, whether it is the processing of their Veterans Administration disability claim, whatever it may be, we are here to talk about a resolution to enable the Federal Government to keep going through the end of January.

We are in that situation because the kind of bickering that we are hearing from too many people on this floor was what predominated last year and kept us from adopting any permanent appropriations legislation.

Some Members are saying we do not want to talk about keeping things going, we do not want to talk anything until we can solve all of the problems and put a lot of new issues on the table. I guess they want to go ahead and let the government shut down. If that is Members' desire, and what they really want to do is mask that desire through other verbiage that they are throwing at us, I wish they would be open about it.

But the resolution under consideration is to allow continuing expenditures at predetermined, ordinary rates so until we can work out all these problems things do not come to a grinding halt. We are not going to be able to have time to work on the permanent solutions to the very funding problems that Members are complaining about unless we can get things like this through. When all of the time has to be devoted to temporary stopgap measures, that takes away from the time that we need to devote to permanent measures.

The American people spoke last fall in the elections. They said they want us to be solvers. They want us to be working towards solutions, not bogging down in bickering and petty parliamentary complaints.

Mr. Speaker, this is legislation that we need to adopt. It is responsible. I do not hear Members complaining about it, or the other side of the aisle saying we want to shut things down instead. But they do want to throw all sorts of barriers and roadblocks that will mean the current spending authority will expire, we will have a government shut-down.

We are trying to be responsible, Mr. Speaker. We should pass this resolution tonight so we can then work together on the permanent solutions and the permanent appropriations bills that need to be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I thank the leadership for bringing this up, and I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) feels that we are unduly taxing his capacities by raising all of these complex issues. I did not think that the Sarbanes-Oxley corporate accountability bill came as entirely a shock to Members on the other side of the aisle.

We just heard that we are raising new issues. All we are asking for and all I mentioned was let us fund the Securities and Exchange Commission at the level this House and the rest of the government said was appropriate last August. It is not a complicated matter. I am not trying to raise new obstacles. The gentleman said this is just an ordinary bill.

I thought there was a decision by the Congress and the President last summer that ordinary was not good enough for the Securities and Exchange Commission, that we had to do some extraordinary things to combat abuses in the securities industry. So when I say that we should fund the level that we said we would fund, apparently for the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) that is too complicated.

□ 2000

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, we wanted to bring some sort of information here because I was listening back in my office. In the CR under consideration today are two provisions providing the Securities and Exchange Commission with additional authorities and resources to protect investors. That is already in the CR. The second provision allows the SEC to fund the start-up expenses of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board to begin to provide the additional necessary scrutiny in corporate accounting.

There was also a bill put in earlier today, I believe it has been put in, which does the following: with regard to the fiscal year 2003 Commerce-State-Justice appropriations bill, and the gentleman from Massachusetts was referring to this, it includes \$776 million for the Securities and Exchange Commission. That is the level that is authorized by the Sarbanes-Oxley bill. It is \$209 million, I will tell the gentleman, above the President's request;

and it is higher than the amount that was in the Senate bill.

In addition to fully funding the SEC's pay parity cost, the funding will include an increase of \$100 million for information technology initiatives such as enhanced automated analytical tools, an integrated document management system, a central data repository and various e-government projects.

It will also, I will tell the body so they feel very comfortable in voting for what the gentleman was talking about on the CR, the funding level will also provide for hundreds of additional accountants, attorneys and examiners to substantially increase oversight of auditors and audit services, enhance the commission's investigative and enforcement capability, improve disclosure of information to investors, and perform various other oversight duties. So that bill has been introduced and is in the hopper tonight.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The gentleman says it has been introduced, but it is not in this version here. It has been introduced for later adoption. It is not a number that is in this bill.

Mr. WOLF. But it is introduced to be the subject of, and we are committed to those figures, to be the subject of the 2003 conference. We are actually higher with regard to that than what the Senate had. That is the subject of us going to conference. It is higher than what the administration asked for and also higher than what the Senate has.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Providing more money than this administration asked for for opposing corporate abuses is not a great thing. What the gentleman from Virginia has said is they have now introduced a bill to be acted on at some future date that will carry out the funding level of Sarbanes-Oxley. But the fact is that we are now in our sixth or seventh continuing resolution and we have not got it yet. I am pleased to know that a bill has been introduced, but it does not do anything for the SEC now. Why not simply in this version of the continuing resolution put that number in there? The bill passed in August. The President in August signed the bill and said, "I'm improving corporate accountability." Several opportunities have gone by to actually fund it at that level, and the answer from the gentleman from Virginia is, "Don't worry. Hope is on the way. The Lone Ranger is coming. We actually introduced the bill." I never heard of a bill being introduced that was immediately implemented.

If, in fact, that is the right number, why not have it in this bill?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished

gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), who has just become chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this continuing resolution, and I really want to thank Chairman YOUNG for all the hard work that he has put into this process. I want to thank also the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) on the minority side. It is not easy. I know. This may be one of the hardest jobs in the House that the chairman has and the ranking member, too. The continuing resolution is an essential bill, and obviously I strongly urge all my colleagues to support it. I do not think the appropriations process has ever been easy, and I think this particular situation is maybe one of the most difficult that we have ever had, at least in my understanding. All we can do is take the situation that we have and do the very best that we can. I believe that is exactly what we are going to do.

The President has made it pretty clear, quite clear, that he will not sign any bills that push us over the discretionary level of \$750.5 billion. I believe we have to pay attention to that. We have to respect that. And I believe we will. The gulf between the spending levels between the two bodies has now been closed. I understand that we are now close to agreeing to new allocations for the fiscal year 2003 bills that have not been completed.

As my colleagues will remember, this was one of the key problems last year as we attempted, as some attempted, rather, to throw fiscal discipline out the window. Not everybody may be happy, either, with the final allocations; but they are critical to move this process forward. Time is of the essence. We have to complete the fiscal year 2003 bills so we can properly focus on fiscal year 2004, which is why again we must pass this continuing resolution. Further delays run the risk of the Federal Government operating for an entire year under a continuing resolution. That is the alternative. What is it you want to do? If that is what you want as an alternative, that is the only thing that is out there. I do not think either side of the aisle will be satisfied with that outcome. The blame game is easy. By the way, if I were in the minority, I might be saying some of the same things that you are saying and doing some of the same things.

But the hard work, by the way, is being done by Chairman YOUNG and, yes, Ranking Member OBEY to bring the fiscal year 2003, I am talking about 2003, by the way, and we should be talking about 2004, bring the fiscal year 2003 appropriation bills to a successful resolution.

I just say, let us pass this CR and let us get back to work. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a point of clarification?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me make clear to the gentleman, if our amendment is passed, we are still substantially below the Republican budget resolution numbers. We do not exceed the amount dictated by the White House. We simply make sure that the money is used for homeland security, for the SEC, and for the other items that you have already voted for in the supplemental.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to provide for continuing appropriations for the United States Government through January 31 of this year with the exception, of course, of the Defense and Military Construction bills that we have already passed and have had enacted into law.

Like a lot of my colleagues and certainly other members of the Committee on Appropriations, I have been frustrated that we were not able during the regular course of events last year and even into the beginning of the next fiscal year, but still during the course of the 107th Congress, that we have found ourselves unable to complete work on the appropriations legislation for fiscal year 2003. And so we find ourselves here in the 108th Congress, a new Congress, a new body, new committees, new personnel, faced with still doing almost all of the appropriation bills for 2003. I am not into the blame game of pointing the fingers as to where the responsibility for this lies. I think that one can look at the political facts that caused us all, neither side, to want to complete the work during the calendar year 2002.

And so we find ourselves here in 2003, at the beginning of a new Congress, a new calendar year, and in the second quarter of this fiscal year with the appropriation bills still unfinished. I have high hopes that the new Congress, the 108th Congress, can move speedily to complete this work. But it cannot be done unless we give authorization to the government to continue its work, all the agencies of the Federal Government that have appropriations to continue their work past this coming weekend and to the end of this month. While we are gone from Washington in the next couple of weeks, the Senate will be taking up these appropriation bills. The plan is that they will add them to our continuing resolution and we will have an opportunity to go to conference and discuss them there.

Whatever one thinks of the process, I think one has to look at the end result, which is to try to get the appropriation bills done for 2003 so that we can get into the regular appropriation bills for 2004, and I think all of us understand that there is going to be a supplemental appropriation bill as well coming up in the next couple of months to

deal with the military and political crisis that we find ourselves dealing with in the Middle East and South Asia.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this body would support this continuing resolution, that we would adopt it, and that we would get on with the work of adopting the bills for 2003 before the end of this month and that we can do the regular work of fiscal year 2004 in the next year.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I take this time, Mr. Speaker, to explain to the House the amendment that I will shortly offer. That amendment will do essentially two things: it would provide an additional \$308 million for the Securities and Exchange Commission to increase funding to the level agreed to in the Sarbanes-Oxley bill. Secondly, it would make available \$5.1 billion in critical funding already agreed to by the House last year as contingent emergencies in the fiscal year 2002 supplemental. That money will pay for items such as helping to find, arrest and deport high-risk individuals who have disregarded the departure date on their visas. It would provide for increased security of U.S. nuclear weapons and nuclear materials at DOE weapons labs, money which the DOE has asked for. It would provide money for the Customs Container Security initiative suggested by the agency. It would provide \$275 million for veterans health care, which this House has already approved on a contingent appropriation basis. It would provide \$415 million for grants to State and local first responders, and a variety of other items which the House has already approved, but which the President has declined to release.

As I told the House earlier today, right after the election I was watching McNeil-Lehrer. In their panel discussion, Tom Oliphant, the columnist, was asked what the role of the Democratic Party was going to be now that the Republican Party had all of the marbles in every institution. He said, "Well, their obligation as the minority is to offer alternatives to what the majority proposes." That is exactly what we are trying to do. The problem with the rule that was adopted earlier is that it attempts to preclude us from meeting those responsibilities as a minority to offer constructive alternatives. In the process, it also denies the ability to hold either the majority or the minority accountable for the decisions they make. That is why we are attempting to move forward with this amendment.

I would hope when the time comes that no point of order is lodged against the amendment so that we can, in fact, meet the obligations that we have in this House to be a real legislative body, not a Soviet-style Congress where a few unknown individuals make decisions and then subvert the process in order to predetermine the outcome.

□ 2015

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I will be very brief just to say that it has been an interesting debate as usual. I appreciate the work that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I are able to do together because we do agree a lot. My position is we should pass this CR and get on with completing the work of the 107th Congress. There are a lot of good issues raised here today by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), by others, but those will be fixed, and I am as anxious as they are to get those fixes in place. I would like to pass this CR now. I would like to take up the second CR immediately, pass it now, and get on to finalizing the work of the 107th Congress by completing the appropriations process for that Congress because we are starting the process for the 108th Congress for fiscal year 2004.

We anticipate the budget from the administration shortly. We will begin our hearings in our subcommittees shortly. We will have a budget resolution this year that we will begin then to mark up our bills and bring them to the floor, but let us get this behind us, let us get this off the table, get it off the desk, get it out of contention. Pass the CR and let us get on to the business of the 108th Congress.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, only one day into the new Congress and the Republican Leadership's procedures for advancing legislation are an outrage that purposefully seeks to limit meaningful debate. By stifling opportunities to present alternatives by either Democrats or Republicans, the House leadership is showing its unwillingness to legislate and its lack of fiscal responsibility.

This morning we passed legislation to extend unemployment benefits for millions of Americans out of work. Unfortunately, due to the Republican leadership procedures, provisions could not be added to provide benefits to 1 million whose benefits have already expired.

Now, with this Continuing Resolution, we are faced with a provision for the Department of Homeland Security that would allow the Administration to bypass a normal review by the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and win blanket approval on the House floor for its plan to lease up to 575,000 square feet at a cost of up to \$250 million. There are important security, infrastructure, and fiscal considerations left undiscussed by this approach.

The Republican leadership is not just afraid of the Democratic proposals, but they are afraid of their own moderate members and the American public. Decision-making that leaves out normal congressional and committee processes is an attempt to remove democratic debate and public opinion from the table. This is a horrible way to begin the new Congress. The American public deserves better.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.J. Res. 1, the continuing resolution to fund the Federal Government through January 31. It is an abomination that only two appropriations bills have been

passed by this Congress—the Defense and Military Construction bills. We have essentially been operating without set spending levels for the Federal Government since the fiscal year began October 1.

My priorities include funding for education, protecting Medicaid, and providing funds for HIV/AIDS in Africa. I understand the fiscal constraints, but I also realize that Federal agencies and our constituents need funding provided from the various appropriations bills.

This resolution does extend entitlement payments including Food Stamps, Medicaid Grants to states and veterans' entitlements. The appropriations bills that fund these programs have not been passed. We simply cannot keep passing continuing resolutions with set spending levels. Congress is not living up to its responsibility as stated in the U.S. Constitution in Article 1.

Congress must do its work. We have eleven appropriations bills that have yet to be passed by Congress and enacted into law. The Labor-HHS appropriations bill funds the Department of Education, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Health and Human Services.

The Democratic priorities in education health care must be fully funded. Last year, we passed the No Child Left Behind Act, but have yet to fund the bill at levels to ensure the adequacy of the measures contained in the education bill.

I am concerned about the increasing spread of AIDS/HIV in Africa. I support funding for research in this area and getting the necessary medical supplies and medicine to combat this disease to Africa.

Congress adjourned last year with much unfinished business. Passing the appropriations bills must be on our list of priorities. We cannot continue this uncertainty in the budget process. This is the sixth continuing resolution.

The president will soon release his fiscal year 2004 budget and we have not yet passed eleven funding bills for fiscal year 2003.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered read for amendment, and pursuant to House Resolution 15, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. OBEY. I think the Speaker can safely assume that, yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 1 to a select committee consisting of Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after "2003", insert the following:

"Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, \$776,000,000 is available for the Securities and Exchange Commission, Salaries and expenses."

At the end of the joint resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 7. Public Law 107-229 is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 138. In addition to the amounts made available by section 101, and subject to sections 107(c) and 108, amounts made available in Public Law 107-206 only to the extent that an official budget request is transmitted by the President shall be considered available for obligation."

Mr. OBEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit because it violates section 302(c) of the Congressional Budget Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman care to argue further on his point of order?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, Section 302(c) prohibits the consideration of any amendment that provides for new budget authority for a fiscal year until the Committee on Appropriations has made the suballocations required by section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act.

This motion to recommit increases the amount of budget authority provided by the measure. The suballocations published by the Committee on Appropriations on October 10 of 2002 lapsed upon the adjournment of the 107th Congress, and no 302(b) suballocations have been made for the 108th Congress. Hence I make the point of order that this motion to recommit violates section 302(c) of the Congressional Budget Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from Minnesota is asserting is that the minority should not be allowed to offer a legitimate amendment because the majority did not fulfill its responsibilities to abide by certain provisions of the Budget Act and by the timetable of that act. I find that highly objectionable especially since the Committee on Rules has already waived the requirement as far as the majority party is concerned. It seems to me that the House rules certainly ought to allow the minority the same privilege that the majority has arranged by rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, when we have points of order, they are important because they establish precedents, and for that reason I

intend, if the Chair rules in favor of this point of order, to join in trying to overturn it because I cannot think of a more damaging precedent.

What this does is to take advantage of the fact that the House did not complete the fiscal 2003 appropriations when it should have in the last calendar year. Thus we are now dealing with fiscal 2003 appropriations in a Congress later than we should, not just a year later but in a Congress later than we should. Because it is a later Congress than it should be, the 302(b) allocations expired. Instead of routinely reenacting them, the majority waived the requirement for itself in a rule and did not waive it for any amendment; so the precedent being set will be as follows: Do not get the work done on time, let it go over until the next Congress months after it should have been done; then abstain from the routine act that the gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned, give yourself a waiver from your failure to act, and do not give it to anyone else. So the precedent is that if you delay the appropriations bills, you can bring them to the floor in an unamendable fashion, totally unamendable so that when we complain about the underfunding of the Securities Exchange Commission we are told do not despair, we have introduced a bill and one of these days we might even act on it. Nothing could be more damaging to the democratic fabric of this House.

And I will say that I often, when an appeal to the Chair is made, will vote to uphold the Chair even when I disagree with the legislative consequence, but in this case we are not talking about a standing rule of the House. We are not talking about interfering with those rules that try to govern our deliberations. We are talking about objecting to a deliberate scheme to bring the appropriations for the entire government to the floor of the House in an absolutely unamendable fashion.

The leadership on the other side used to boast, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, about we always get a motion to recommit. This is a motion to recommit, an entirely germane motion to recommit on the substance that is being ruled out of order on this ground, and for that reason I hope the Chair will not sustain this degradation of democracy.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, just to correct the record, the gentleman from Massachusetts is one of the experts when it comes to the rules of the House, and I commend him for that, but just to be technically correct with regard to his statement, it is not because we failed to do appropriation bills that the 302(b) allocations did not carry forward. It is because the Senate failed to produce a budget that the 302(b) allocation did not carry forward. Had a budget resolution been com-

pleted, the 302(b) allocations would have carried forward even though it was a new Congress.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and that is true. But it is also true that we could have in this House passed those appropriations bills without any action from any other body, and it is a fact in addition that we did not finish the work last year that put us in the situation which the majority takes advantage of by denying the House the chance to have even a germane recommit on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would take this opportunity to remind those who are speaking to the point of order that their comments should be directed through the Chair.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I support the point of order. The gentleman from Massachusetts is correct that certainly appropriation bills could have moved forward. We deemed the budget in order for that process to continue. There are many reasons why appropriation bills did not move forward, but the only fact I wanted to make clear for the RECORD and for the purpose of precedent setting, if there will be precedent setting this evening, is that in fact it was the failure of a budget to be produced by the Senate and not failure of appropriation bills to be produced that causes this extraordinary procedure to occur this evening. I hope this is not precedent setting because it is very unfortunate that in fact for the first time since the 1974 Budget Act was passed that the other body failed to produce a budget.

Mr. Speaker, I support the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unless the gentleman from Minnesota desires to speak further on the point of order, the Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I will let the Chair rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) makes a point of order that the amendment proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) violates section 302(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. Section 302(c) precludes consideration after the Committee on Appropriations has received a section 302(a) allocation for a fiscal year of a measure within the committee's jurisdiction that provides new budget authority until the committee makes the suballocations required under section 302(b).

The amendment proposed in the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin provides new budget authority, and the Committee on Appropriations has not made the required section 302(b) suballocations, and as such, the motion to recommit violates section 302(c) of the Budget Act. The point of order is sustained, and the motion is not in order.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to appeal the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is: Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. GUTKNECHT

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) to lay the appeal on the table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 192, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—217

Aderholt	Doolittle	Kirk
Akin	Dreier	Kline
Bachus	Duncan	Knollenberg
Baker	Dunn	Kolbe
Ballenger	Ehlers	LaHood
Barrett (SC)	Emerson	Latham
Bartlett (MD)	English	LaTourette
Barton (TX)	Everett	Leach
Bass	Feeney	Lewis (CA)
Beauprez	Ferguson	Lewis (KY)
Bereuter	Flake	Linder
Biggart	Fletcher	LoBiondo
Bilirakis	Foley	Lucas (OK)
Bishop (UT)	Forbes	Manzullo
Blackburn	Fossella	McCotter
Blunt	Franks (AZ)	McHugh
Boehrlert	Frelinghuysen	McKeon
Boehner	Galleghy	Mica
Bonilla	Garrett (NJ)	Miller (FL)
Bonner	Gerlach	Miller (MI)
Bono	Gibbons	Moran (KS)
Boozman	Gilchrest	Murphy
Bradley (NH)	Gingrey	Musgrave
Brady (TX)	Goode	Myrick
Brown (SC)	Goodlatte	Ney
Brown-Waite,	Granger	Northup
Ginny	Graves	Norwood
Burgess	Green (WI)	Nunes
Burns	Greenwood	Nussle
Burr	Gutknecht	Osborne
Burton (IN)	Harris	Ose
Buyer	Hart	Otter
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Paul
Camp	Hayes	Pearce
Cannon	Hefley	Pence
Cantor	Hensarling	Peterson (PA)
Capito	Herger	Petri
Carter	Hobson	Pickering
Castle	Hoekstra	Pitts
Chabot	Hostettler	Platts
Chocola	Houghton	Pombo
Coble	Hulshof	Porter
Cole	Hunter	Portman
Collins	Hyde	Pryce (OH)
Combest	Isakson	Putnam
Cox	Issa	Quinn
Crane	Istook	Radanovich
Crenshaw	Jenkins	Ramstad
Cubin	Johnson (CT)	Regula
Culberson	Johnson (IL)	Rehberg
Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Renzi
Davis, Jo Ann	Jones (NC)	Reynolds
Davis, Tom	Keller	Rogers (AL)
Deal (GA)	Kelly	Rogers (KY)
DeLay	Kennedy (MN)	Rogers (MI)
DeMint	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart, L.	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kingston	Royce

Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)

Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey

Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—192

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLoach
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva

Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-
 McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler

Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda
 T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—24

Baird
Ballance
Becerra
Cardin
Gephardt
Gillmor
Goss
McInnis
Gutierrez

Hayworth
Janklow
Kilpatrick
Kind
Lipinski
McCrery
McInnis
Miller, Gary

Napolitano
Nethercutt
Oxley
Payne
Rush
Slaughter
Towns
Weldon (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER) (during the vote). The Chair would advise Members of the House

that there are 2 minutes remaining on the 15-minute clock.

□ 2045

Ms. BONO and Mr. ISSA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 2045

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an alternative motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). Is the gentleman still opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. OBEY. I certainly am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 1 to a select committee consisting of Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

(1) On page 3, line 8, of the joint resolution, strike everything after “December 24, 2002,” to the end of the section and insert the following “shall require approval by the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and a select committee of the House consisting of Mr. Young of Alaska, Mr. LaTourette of Ohio and Mr. Oberstar of Minnesota.

(b) PROHIBITION ON DELEGATION.—The authority of the General Services Administration to lease space under this section may not be delegated to any other department or agency.”

(2) At the end of the joint resolution, insert the following section:

“SEC. 7.—Public Law 107-229 is further amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

“SEC. 138. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement section 1717 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 or the amendments to section 2133 of the Public Health Service Act made by sections 1714, 1715 and 1716 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (other than to process, adjudicate or pay claims for compensation under the program established by subtitle 2 of title XXI of the Public Health Service Act).

“SEC. 139. None of the fund made available by this Act may be obligated by the Secretary of Homeland Security in violation of section 835 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, which for purposes of this section shall be applied (1) by inserting immediately before the period in subsection (a) ‘or with any direct or indirect subsidiary of such an entity’ and (2) by substituting the phrase ‘before, on or after the date’ for ‘after the date’ in subsection (b)(1) of such section 835.”

Mr. OBEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the House is not in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. The House will be in order.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit would do three things: It would modify the language in the Department of Homeland Security legislation to prevent existing corporations who moved offshore to avoid paying their fair share of taxes from getting government contracts from that agency. It would bring the bill back in line with the language this House voted to include by a vote of 318 to 110 on the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) last July.

The Joint Committee on Taxation has estimated that over the next 10 years corporate expatriates would cost us more than \$4 billion in funds that could help pay for our Nation's security.

The second point of this motion to recommit would be to suspend the operation of one of the most egregious provisions inserted into the Department of Homeland Security legislation at the last minute last year. That is a provision apparently designed to shield the giant drugmaker Eli Lilly & Company from lawsuits that have been brought by parents of autistic children claiming that their children's disease was caused by a vaccine preservative.

There may be good reason to ultimately require claims of this type to be brought under the Federal Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, but if that is done, it should be done openly in the sunshine after proper hearings and deliberation, not in a back room deal at the last moment.

Thirdly, this motion would restore the authority of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to review the leasing of space for the new Department of Homeland Security, replacing the provision in the CR that simply approves the administration proposal without any congressional oversight or scrutiny whatsoever.

We do not stop them from going forward, we simply say that they must follow the procedure of having some review by the committee of jurisdiction before they proceed to spend a great deal of taxpayers' money on leasing property which at this point has been reviewed and overseen by no one whatsoever in the Congress.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

I just wanted to remind my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that in fact there were 318 people in this body last year who came together and we voted to end the practice of rewarding those corporations who take their corporations

overseas just for the ostensible purpose of not paying their taxes, of avoiding their most basic responsibility. We said no, they can no longer do that and get rewarded with government contracts.

Why? Why are we weakening the language that 318 or 319 people voted on? It is what we expect of American citizens, to pay their taxes every year. Why are we going to weaken this law with regard to these corporations? We have an opportunity tonight to right this wrong.

When push came to shove, this House weakened its language. We put good corporate citizens at a permanent disadvantage by protecting these companies who have moved overseas to avoid their most basic responsibility, and tonight we have the opportunity to right that wrong. We will not be acting responsibly this evening if we in fact vote to allow a small number of people who, quite frankly, put aside their American responsibilities, at a time when this Nation in fact is ostensibly on its way to war, and allow them to do what we would not allow anyone else to do.

We ought to right this wrong, we ought to vote for this motion to recommit, and live up to our responsibilities as the representatives of the good people of this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) rise in opposition to the motion to recommit?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I definitely rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as is so often the case, the motions of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) are creative and appealing, and address subjects that should be addressed.

What I would ask the House to do is to reject the motion to recommit. Let us get on with the regular order of dealing with these issues in the regular order, which we expect to do in a very expeditious manner.

At this point, because we do not want to make too many major decisions in the dark of night, as we hear so often, let us simply vote against this motion to recommit, pass the continuing resolution, deal with House Joint Resolution 1, and get out of here for tonight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair

will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote, if ordered, on the question of passage, and, after that, on the motion to suspend the rules and adopt House Resolution 10.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 220, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

AYES—192

Abercrombie	Grijalva	Neal (MA)
Ackerman	Harman	Oberstar
Alexander	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Allen	Hill	Oliver
Andrews	Hinchey	Ortiz
Baca	Hinojosa	Owens
Baldwin	Hoeffel	Pallone
Becerra	Holden	Pascarell
Bell	Holt	Pastor
Berkley	Honda	Pelosi
Berman	Hoyer	Peterson (MN)
Berry	Inslee	Pomeroy
Bishop (GA)	Israel	Price (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Jackson (IL)	Rahall
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Boswell	(TX)	Reyes
Boucher	John	Rodriguez
Boyd	Johnson, E. B.	Ross
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	Rothman
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Brown, Corrine	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Capps	Kennedy (RI)	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Kildee	Sabo
Cardoza	Klecicka	Sanchez, Linda
Carson (IN)	Kucinich	T.
Carson (OK)	Lampson	Sanchez, Loretta
Case	Langevin	Sanders
Clay	Lantos	Sandlin
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Cooper	Lee	Scott (GA)
Costello	Levin	Scott (VA)
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Crowley	Lofgren	Sherman
Cummings	Lowe	Skelton
Davis (AL)	Lucas (KY)	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Davis (FL)	Majette	Snyder
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Solis
Davis (TN)	Markey	Spratt
DeFazio	Marshall	Stark
DeGette	Matheson	Stenholm
Delahunt	Matsui	Strickland
DeLauro	McCarthy (MO)	Stupak
Deutsch	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner
Dicks	McCollum	Tauscher
Dingell	McDermott	Taylor (MS)
Doggett	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Dooley (CA)	McIntyre	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	McNulty	Tierney
Edwards	Meehan	Turner (TX)
Emanuel	Meek (FL)	Udall (CO)
Engel	Meeks (NY)	Udall (NM)
Eshoo	Menendez	Van Hollen
Etheridge	Michaud	Velazquez
Evans	Millender	Visclosky
Farr	McDonald	Waters
Fattah	Miller (NC)	Watson
Filner	Miller, George	Watt
Ford	Mollohan	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Moore	Weiner
Frost	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Gonzalez	Murtha	Woolsey
Gordon	Nadler	Wu
Green (TX)	Napolitano	Wynn

NOES—220

Aderholt	Bonner	Castle
Akin	Bono	Chabot
Bachus	Boozman	Chocola
Baker	Bradley (NH)	Coble
Ballenger	Brady (TX)	Cole
Barrett (SC)	Brown (SC)	Collins
Bartlett (MD)	Brown-Waite,	Combest
Barton (TX)	Ginny	Cox
Bass	Burgess	Crane
Beauprez	Burns	Crenshaw
Bereuter	Burr	Cubin
Biggert	Burton (IN)	Culberson
Bilirakis	Buyer	Cunningham
Bishop (UT)	Calvert	Davis, Jo Ann
Blackburn	Camp	Davis, Tom
Blunt	Cannon	Deal (GA)
Boehlert	Cantor	DeLay
Boehner	Capito	DeMint
Bonilla	Carter	Diaz-Balart, L.

Diaz-Balart, M.	Kelly	Rehberg
Doolittle	Kennedy (MN)	Renzi
Dreier	King (IA)	Reynolds
Duncan	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Dunn	Kingston	Rogers (KY)
Ehlers	Kirk	Rogers (MI)
Emerson	Kline	Rohrabacher
English	Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen
Everett	Kolbe	Royce
Feeney	LaHood	Ryan (WI)
Ferguson	Latham	Ryun (KS)
Flake	LaTourette	Saxton
Fletcher	Leach	Schrock
Foley	Lewis (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Sessions
Fossella	Linder	Shadegg
Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo	Shaw
Frelinghuysen	Lucas (OK)	Shays
Gallely	Manzullo	Sherwood
Garrett (NJ)	McCotter	Shimkus
Gerlach	McHugh	Shuster
Gibbons	McKeon	Simmons
Gilchrest	Mica	Simpson
Gingrey	Miller (FL)	Smith (MI)
Goode	Miller (MI)	Smith (NJ)
Goodlatte	Moran (KS)	Smith (TX)
Granger	Murphy	Souder
Graves	Musgrave	Stearns
Green (WI)	Myrick	Sullivan
Greenwood	Ney	Sweeney
Gutknecht	Northup	Tancredo
Hall	Norwood	Tauzin
Harris	Nunes	Taylor (NC)
Hart	Nussle	Terry
Hastings (WA)	Osborne	Thomas
Hayes	Ose	Thornberry
Hefley	Otter	Tiahrt
Hensarling	Oxley	Tiberi
Herger	Paul	Toomey
Hobson	Pearce	Turner (OH)
Hoekstra	Pence	Upton
Hostettler	Peterson (PA)	Vitter
Houghton	Petri	Walden (OR)
Hulshof	Pickering	Walsh
Hunter	Pitts	Wamp
Hyde	Platts	Weldon (FL)
Isakson	Pombo	Weller
Issa	Porter	Whitfield
Istook	Portman	Wicker
Jenkins	Pryce (OH)	Wilson (NM)
Johnson (CT)	Putnam	Wilson (SC)
Johnson (IL)	Quinn	Wolf
Johnson, Sam	Radanovich	Young (AK)
Jones (NC)	Ramstad	Young (FL)
Keller	Regula	

NOT VOTING—21

Baird	Hayworth	McInnis
Ballance	Janklow	Miller, Gary
Cardin	Jefferson	Nethercutt
Gephardt	Kilpatrick	Payne
Gillmor	Kind	Rush
Goss	Lipinski	Towns
Gutierrez	McCrery	Weldon (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER) (during the vote). The Chair would advise Members that there are 2 minutes left on the 15-minute clock.

□ 2112

Mrs. MALONEY changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, due to a family emergency, I was unavoidably absent on January 8, 2003. I ask the RECORD to reflect that, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote 7, final passage of

S. 23, the Unemployment Insurance Benefits Extension Act.

CONGRATULATING OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY BUCKEYES FOOTBALL TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 10.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 10, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 1, answered “present” 4, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—404

Abercrombie	Chocola	Fossella
Ackerman	Clay	Frank (MA)
Aderholt	Clyburn	Franks (AZ)
Akin	Coble	Frelinghuysen
Alexander	Cole	Frost
Allen	Collins	Gallely
Andrews	Combest	Garrett (NJ)
Baca	Conyers	Gephardt
Bachus	Cooper	Gerlach
Baker	Costello	Gibbons
Baldwin	Cox	Gilchrest
Ballenger	Cramer	Gingrey
Barrett (SC)	Crane	Gonzalez
Bartlett (MD)	Crenshaw	Goode
Barton (TX)	Crowley	Goodlatte
Bass	Cubin	Gordon
Beauprez	Culberson	Granger
Becerra	Cummings	Graves
Bell	Cunningham	Green (TX)
Bereuter	Davis (AL)	Green (WI)
Berkley	Davis (CA)	Greenwood
Berman	Davis (FL)	Grijalva
Berry	Davis (IL)	Gutknecht
Biggart	Davis (TN)	Hall
Bishop (GA)	Davis, Jo Ann	Harman
Bishop (NY)	Davis, Tom	Harris
Bishop (UT)	Deal (GA)	Hart
Blackburn	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)
Blumenauer	DeGette	Hastings (WA)
Blunt	DeLauro	Hayes
Boehlert	DeLay	Hefley
Boehner	DeMint	Hensarling
Bonilla	Deutsch	Herger
Bonner	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hill
Bono	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hinojosa
Boozman	Dicks	Hobson
Boswell	Dingell	Hoefel
Boucher	Doggett	Hoekstra
Boyd	Dooley (CA)	Holden
Bradley (NH)	Doolittle	Holt
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Honda
Brown (OH)	Dreier	Hostettler
Brown (SC)	Duncan	Houghton
Brown, Corrine	Dunn	Hoyer
Brown-Waite,	Edwards	Hulshof
Ginny	Ehlers	Hunter
Burgess	Emanuel	Hyde
Burns	Emerson	Inslee
Burr	Engel	Isakson
Burton (IN)	Buyer	Israel
Butler	Eshoo	Issa
Calvert	Etheridge	Istook
Camp	Evans	Jackson (IL)
Cannon	Everett	Jackson-Lee
Cantor	Farr	(TX)
Capito	Fattah	Jefferson
Capps	Feeney	Jenkins
Capuano	Ferguson	John
Cardoza	Filner	Johnson (CT)
Carson (IN)	Flake	Johnson (IL)
Carson (OK)	Fletcher	Johnson, E. B.
Carter	Foley	Johnson, Sam
Case	Forbes	Jones (NC)
Castle	Ford	Jones (OH)
Chabot		Kanjorski

Keller	Nadler	Serrano
Kelly	Napolitano	Sessions
Kennedy (MN)	Neal (MA)	Shadegg
Kennedy (RI)	Ney	Shaw
Kildee	Northup	Shays
King (IA)	Norwood	Sherman
King (NY)	Nunes	Sherwood
Kingston	Nussle	Shimkus
Kirk	Oberstar	Shuster
Kleczka	Oliver	Simmons
Kline	Ortiz	Simpson
Knollenberg	Osborne	Skelton
Kolbe	Ose	Slaughter
Kucinich	Otter	Smith (MI)
LaHood	Owens	Smith (NJ)
Lampson	Oxley	Smith (TX)
Langevin	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Lantos	Pascarell	Snyder
Larsen (WA)	Pastor	Solis
Larson (CT)	Paul	Souder
Latham	Pearce	Spratt
LaTourette	Pelosi	Stark
Leach	Pence	Stearns
Lee	Peterson (MN)	Stenholm
Levin	Peterson (PA)	Strickland
Lewis (CA)	Petri	Stupak
Lewis (GA)	Pickering	Sweeney
Lewis (KY)	Pitts	Tancredo
Linder	Platts	Tanner
LoBiondo	Pombo	Tauscher
Lofgren	Pomeroy	Tauzin
Lowey	Porter	Taylor (MS)
Lucas (KY)	Portman	Taylor (NC)
Lucas (OK)	Price (NC)	Terry
Lynch	Pryce (OH)	Thomas
Majette	Putnam	Thompson (CA)
Maloney	Quinn	Thompson (MS)
Manzullo	Radanovich	Thornberry
Markey	Rahall	Tiahrt
Marshall	Ramstad	Tiberi
Matheson	Rangel	Toomey
Matsui	Regula	Turner (OH)
McCarthy (MO)	Rehberg	Turner (TX)
McCarthy (NY)	Renzi	Udall (CO)
McCollum	Reyes	Udall (NM)
McCotter	Reynolds	Upton
McGovern	Rodriguez	Van Hollen
McHugh	Rogers (AL)	Velazquez
McIntyre	Rogers (KY)	Visclosky
McKeon	Rogers (MI)	Vitter
McNulty	Rohrabacher	Walden (OR)
Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Walsh
Meek (FL)	Ross	Wamp
Meeks (NY)	Rothman	Waters
Menendez	Roybal-Allard	Watson
Mica	Royce	Watt
Michaud	Ruppersberger	Waxman
Millender-	Ryan (OH)	Weiner
McDonald	Ryan (WI)	Weldon (FL)
Miller (FL)	Ryun (KS)	Weller
Miller (MI)	Sabo	Wexler
Miller (NC)	Sanchez, Linda	Whitfield
Miller, George	T.	Wicker
Mollohan	Sanchez, Loretta	Wilson (NM)
Moore	Sandlin	Wilson (SC)
Moran (KS)	Saxton	Wolf
Moran (VA)	Schakowsky	Woolsey
Murphy	Schiff	Wu
Murtha	Schrock	Wynn
Musgrave	Scott (GA)	Young (AK)
Myrick	Scott (VA)	Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Sensenbrenner

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—4

Hinchey	Sanders
Obey	Tierney

NOT VOTING—24

Baird	Hayworth	McInnis
Ballance	Janklow	Miller, Gary
Bilirakis	Kaptur	Nethercutt
Brady (TX)	Kilpatrick	Payne
Cardin	Kind	Rush
Gillmor	Lipinski	Sullivan
Goss	McCrery	Towns
Gutierrez	McDermott	Weldon (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER) (during the vote). The Chair would advise the Members that there are 2 minutes left in the 5-minute vote.

□ 2119

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, personal business requires my presence in the district. Had I been present for today's legislative business I would have cast my votes as follows: "nay" on rollcall No. 5, on ordering the previous question during consideration of H. Res. 14; "aye" on rollcall No. 6, on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT); "aye" on rollcall No. 7, S. 23, the Unemployment Insurance Benefits Extension Act; "nay" on rollcall No. 8, on ordering the previous question during consideration of H. Res. 15; "aye" on rollcall No. 9, the motion to adjourn; "nay" on rollcall No. 10 on the motion tabling the appeal of the ruling of the chair; "aye" on rollcall No. 11 on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY; and "yea" on rollcall No. 12 on passage of H. Res. 10, a resolution congratulating the Ohio State University Buckeyes football team.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, this evening I had to depart early for a previously scheduled meeting. As a result, I was not able to be present for rollcall votes 10, 11, and 12. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 10, "nay" on rollcall vote 11, and "yea" on rollcall vote 12.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 2, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 15, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 2) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of H.J. Res. 2 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 2

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 107-229 is further amended by striking the date specified in section 107(e) and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 2003".

SEC. 2. Public Law 107-229, as amended, is further amended in section 120, by striking "and December 1, 2002," and inserting "December 1, 2002, January 1, 2003, and February 1, 2003."

SEC. 3. Section 613 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2002, is amended (1) by striking "2001" and "2002" each place it appears and subsection (a)(1), as so amended, by inserting "(as in effect on September 30, 2002)" after "Act, 2002" and after "such section 613": *Provided*, That such section, as so amended, shall be effective through September 30, 2003, notwithstanding section 107 of this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. Public Law 107-229, as amended, is further amended by striking section 137 and inserting the following new section:

"SEC. 137. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, in addition to amounts made available in section 101, and subject to sections 107(c) and 108, such sums as may be necessary shall be available to the Securities and Exchange Commission for the Secretary of the Treasury to advance start-up expenses to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board pursuant to section 109(j) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-204).

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, upon the collection of fees authorized in section 109(d) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-204), the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board shall reimburse the Securities and Exchange Commission for any Commission appropriations advanced to the Board for start-up expenses pursuant to section 109(j) of such Act or subsection (a) of this section, so as to result in no net effect of such advances on appropriations available to the Commission in fiscal year 2003."

SEC. 5. Section 8005 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2003 (Pub. L. 107-248) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: "Provided further, That in addition to the transfer authority provided in this section, and subject to the terms and conditions of this section except the limitation in the fourth proviso, only to meet unforeseen requirements associated with the global war on terrorism, the Secretary of Defense may transfer an additional \$2,500,000,000 of working capital funds of the Department of Defense or funds made available in titles I through VII of this Act to the Department of Defense for military functions (except military construction), including programs and activities of the National Foreign Intelligence Program (with the concurrence of the Director of Central Intelligence) and the United States Special Operations Command, between such appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred."

SEC. 6. (a) APPROVAL OF PROSPECTUS.—For purposes of section 3307(a) of title 40, United States Code, the prospectus of General Services Administration entitled "Prospectus—Lease, Department of Homeland Security, Washington, DC Metropolitan Area", prospectus number PDC-08W03, as submitted on December 24, 2002, is deemed approved by the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) PROHIBITION ON DELEGATION.—The authority of the General Services Administration to lease space under this section may not be delegated to another department or agency.

(c) MODIFICATIONS.—Any modification to the prospectus referred to in subsection (a)

that is subject to approval under section 3307 of title 40, United States Code, shall be approved in accordance with the requirements of such section.

SEC. 7. Section 126 of Public Law 107-229, as added by Public Law 107-240, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 126. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 107, the District of Columbia may expend local funds for programs and activities under the heading 'District of Columbia Funds—Operating Expenses' at the rate set forth for such programs and activities in the revised financial plan and budget for the District Government for fiscal year 2003 submitted to Congress by the District of Columbia pursuant to section 138 of H.R. 5521 of the 107th Congress, as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 15, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, H.J. Res. 2, is identical to H.J. Res. 1 except for one thing, and that is the provision that allows the Defense Department the authority to transfer within their own accounts, they cannot go outside of their accounts, but to transfer up to \$2.5 billion within their accounts to fight the war on terrorism, to pay for Enduring Freedom and to do the necessary things to make the security of our Nation happen.

Other than that, it would also become the vehicle, we hope the vehicle, for the final appropriations bill for last year. We plan to conclude all of last year's appropriations bills using this as a vehicle that we will send to the Senate. We hope that they will do the right thing and send it back to us and we will either vote on it or go to conference.

Anyway, that is how we are going to conclude our 107th Congress appropriations business.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me simply say that in Wisconsin only cows chew cuds twice, and so we have the same concerns about the consideration of this resolution, but we have already made those concerns quite clear. I see no point in dragging it out.

Let me simply say that with respect to the one difference between this resolution and the previous resolution, on this side of the aisle we agree with the provision that the gentleman is providing. I think it is a constructive provision.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the distinguished gentleman, and I am going to

rush through my comments, and to the chairman of the committee.

I, too, just want to associate myself with the remarks of the earlier debate, but I do want to express the fact that the running of government impacts on the lives of individuals, particularly those who are facing stress, economic stress, and we dealt with this in the unemployment legislation that we passed, but here is my concern as it relates to my particular congressional district.

My concern is public hospitals and the lack of increased funding for Medicaid. I believe it is important to put on the RECORD that we are seeing increased numbers of individuals going to our public hospitals because they have no insurance, they have no alternatives. They are utilizing Medicaid. Some of that obviously has an enormous shortfall, and so the burden is falling upon my local county government.

The longer we stay in this condition, without the actual passing of appropriations bills, the longer we put the burden on the States, the longer we put the burden on local government.

So I just argue that we can pass this CR to the 31st, we passed the other one to the 31st, but all the issues we are concerned about, funding for HIV-AIDS, increased funding for Medicaid, funding Leave No Child Behind, all of that falls, if you will, around our feet and people are suffering. I am just hoping that we will have an opportunity to work in a bipartisan manner on the crisis that is going on in our districts, and we will come to a point where we recognize that we have got to address the needs of working people, but we have also got to address the needs of uninsured and impoverished who need this government to work on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) very kindly for his time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I just ask for a yes vote on this resolution, and I yield back my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered read for amendment, and pursuant to House Resolution 15, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain requests for special orders without prejudice to regular business.

GRANTING MEMBERS OF HOUSE PRIVILEGE TO EXTEND REMARKS AND INCLUDE EXTRANEOUS MATERIAL IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD FOR FIRST SESSION OF 108TH CONGRESS

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for the first session of the 108th Congress all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material within the permitted limit in that section of the RECORD entitled "Extensions of Remarks."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, of course our Nation is on the verge of war, a war against what is called terrorism. It is interesting to think about that word. It is kind of a nebulous term. The enemy moves around the world. I think it is important to take a look at what is happening here at home and to think about who it was that crashed into those trade towers and where they originated from and what might have propelled the hatred that was directed against the people of our country on our home soil.

It is very interesting that the majority of hijackers came from the nation of Saudi Arabia. We look at where they came from, where they were educated and what their motives really were. It is interesting that Saudi Arabia remains the country from which the United States is importing the greatest share of petroleum, and if we look at the balance of accounts today, the primary area in which we have yielded a trade deficit with the world is in imported petroleum.

Oil prices are going up over \$33 a barrel. Every time we go to the gas pump and we buy a gallon, over half of what we spend goes to countries like Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iraq, Venezuela, Nigeria. It is very clear what has been happening. In fact, the current recession we are in, starting in March 2001, was triggered by rising oil prices, and in fact, rising prices at the pump are driving us into deeper recession every day.

When will America see who is controlling the innards of this economy and how where we are importing this oil from is affecting the politics of the world?

□ 2130

Today, I have introduced a bill that will create a biofuels independence initiative for our country. It is time for America to erase our key strategic vulnerability, and that is to imported petroleum and the evil politics that it yields globally.

America has not been serious. Over the decade of the 1980s and 1990s, in spite of four recessions and major oil embargoes, we have continued to import more and more petroleum, which by the year 2050 will indeed be a scarce world resource. Armed forces from throughout the United States have been building air fields in the Middle East. We are being asked to appropriate over \$100 billion to defend the Occidental pipeline in the nation of Colombia. And Venezuela teeters as we sit here this evening.

It is time to pay attention to where the oil comes from, and it is time to do something here at home to revive the sagging and critical state of rural America and, at the same time, create jobs from coast to coast.

One of the most important and neglected areas that we can do something about, if we are serious, is to create the kind of umbrella across our country, as we did with the National Rural Electrification Administration and the National Telephone Administration. We can do the same with the National Biofuels Corporation, so that from coast to coast, where acres can be turned to productive use and move farmers from farming for a government check by going to their mailbox, to farming the marketplace and producing new, renewable clean fuels for America, we will have a win-win-win across every State in this Union.

There are other answers to our energy crisis: cleaning up coal in the Coal Belt that lies between Pennsylvania and Illinois, which has more Btus under the ground than the entire Middle East. Why can we not see it? Why can we not, a Nation that can clean up chemical weapons in Pine Bluff, not find a way to clean up coal? We are not serious.

The bill that we are introducing today says America is long overdue from sending her Marines around the world in special forces to protect the oil highways over the seas. It is time to produce our way to energy independence and create real growth inside this economy.

It should be interesting also for people to know that with every billion dollars of trade deficit that we rack up, that we cannot pay for here at home because of our imports, we have to bond our indebtedness. Today, the United States of America is in hock to about 12 nations around the world, including those very same oil kingdoms, but also nations like China. Not exactly a democratic state.

So I say, think about it, America. Take a look at our Energy Independence Act, H.R. 103. Think about making America energy independent in 10

years. It is time. And it is time to bring our troops home, not conducting any wars for oil on any continent.

HONORING NEW CONSTRUCTION OF JOHN H. STROGER, JR. HOSPITAL OF COOK COUNTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Cook County Board of Commissioners opened a brand new public hospital in Chicago, the John H. Stroger Cook County Hospital. I rise to congratulate and commend President Stroger, the Cook County Board of Commissioners, Ms. Ruth Rothstein, director of the Bureau of Health Services for the county, Mr. Lacy Clay, director of the hospital, and all of the staff for making this milestone possible.

Mr. Speaker, Cook County Hospital is one of the finest hospitals in the Seventh Congressional District and in the nation. Since the 1800s, Cook County Hospital has delivered comprehensive primary, specialty and tertiary health care services to all residents of Cook County, despite socioeconomic status, being uninsured, or their ability to pay. With the astonishing fact that 98 percent of patients who arrive alive at the trauma center survive, this public hospitals is well known nationwide.

Cook County Hospital excels in services and expertise for its level I trauma center, burn unit, the largest neonatal intensive care unit in the Midwest and its women's cancer center, which treats 30 percent of the women with breast cancer in the county. Yet Cook County Hospital could not be the model for public hospitals in our Nation if it were not for the hospital's extraordinary staff. The staff is commended for their consistent dedication and enthusiasm for giving the highest quality of care, even when they worked in a hospital constructed over 100 years ago, which made the task of serving the needs of patients much more complicated.

However, the staff has extended their participation of saving lives in the hospital to help save lives in the communities surrounding the hospital. Though half of the admissions in the trauma unit are a result of assaults, and the majority of those from gun violence, the hospital staff decided to pursue efforts to reduce violence by creating a violence prevention task force, which helped spawn the Chicago Violence Prevention Strategic Plan.

However, on Thursday, December 12, 2002, the historic beauty on West Harrison Street that inspired the hit television show "ER" stopped accepting patients. The remarkable medical staff and their patients were moved to the new modern facility, the John H. Stroger, Jr. Hospital of Cook County. The patients and staff will now be air

conditioned in the summer, have access to oxygen hookups in each room, and have a hospital-wide paging system.

And although the staff expects quality of care to improve along with efficiency, they are certain that the largest impact will be on patients, who gained private bathrooms for the first time, televisions and telephones in their rooms, and nurses stations that are in close proximity in the new hospital. This new hospital will have fewer beds and is smaller than the old, but it is a reflection of the changing times, with fewer inpatient and a growing number of outpatient procedures.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this new development is a testament to Cook County's sensitivity and farsightedness by investing in public health care at a time when cities and counties around the country are closing public hospitals or cutting back services. I commend the Cook County Board in its efforts to make real their mission statement: to provide a comprehensive program of quality care with respect and dignity to the residents of Cook County regardless of their ability to pay.

This new hospital positions the county to do just that, and I again commend them for their farsightedness and their sensitivity in providing high-quality health care to even those with the least ability to pay.

AMERICAN DREAM TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, from the time I arrived in Washington, D.C., now fully more than 2 years ago, I pledged myself to my constituents in eastern Indiana to fight to renew the American Dream; that is that dream of every American, whatever their race, whatever their creed, whatever their color, that they might better themselves and better their families so that not only they but their posterity could enjoy more abundance in this country in every way, material and spiritual, as they pursue that dream.

It is about renewing and restoring the American Dream. Mr. Speaker, that I was proud today to author and to drop into the hopper the American Dream Tax Relief Act of 2003. I am proud that this bill, filed as it is on the very first legislative day of the 108th Congress, is not only my work but the work of some 33 original cosponsors, including many distinguished leaders of this institution and chairmen of major committees.

The American Dream Tax Relief Act, Mr. Speaker, is, quite simply put, an act that would dramatically reduce the taxes on capital gains in this country from their rate, which varies everywhere from 28 percent down to 8 percent, to a single flat capital gains tax rate of 10 percent. The enthusiasm with which this was greeted by my col-

leagues in just a few short hours of trafficking the idea here on Capitol Hill has greatly encouraged me that this is an idea whose time has come.

Mr. Speaker, I would offer to you that while the President of the United States, traveling as he did to the Economic Club of Chicago, did much this week to set the stage for recovery from recession, now is the time for us in this Congress to go beyond strategies for aiding those who are struggling with unemployment and layoffs, as we did earlier today, to go beyond even the President's thoughtful effort to bring the recession finally to a close. We need to begin to pursue, Mr. Speaker, economic policies that, in sum total, will explode the American Dream for an unprecedented generation of our citizens.

Only a significant reduction in taxes on capital will succeed in unleashing the entrepreneurial energy that is buried in the morass of high taxes and overregulation. Reduced taxes on capital will enable working families to save for the future or use invested funds for immediate financial obligations without fear of excessive tax penalties. American families, not the government, will have a greater power, Mr. Speaker, to decide what it is they do with their money. And for all of our great wisdom in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, it seems like every time we give the American people more power over their own money, the Nation and even the coffers of government benefit.

Now, some will argue as we proceed forward with this tax relief measure that we cannot afford this in these times of Federal red ink and deficits and a growing national debt. But the truth is, Mr. Speaker, that the last time the capital gains tax was cut, 1997, under the Clinton administration, prior to the cut, at 28 percent, the capital gains tax generated some \$62 billion per annum to the Federal Government. Within 2 years following the 8 percent cut in the capital gains tax, it became a program that generated \$109 billion to the Federal Government.

It is one of those ironies in a dynamic model of economics that when we lower the tax rate, we actually encourage entrepreneurship, encourage investment, and encourage people to move dollars out of passive assets into productive assets. And, in so doing, not only do the American people win, but the government wins with higher revenues.

This has been the unflagging experience of the capital gains tax when President Kennedy reduced it, when President Reagan reduced it, and even when President Clinton signed a reduction in the capital gains tax. As President John F. Kennedy said, not only is it a good thing for government, but in every real sense it is great for the American people.

Some will say it benefits the rich. And to that, I confess, it will. It will benefit the wealthy in this country. It will benefit the middle class in this

country. It will benefit working Americans struggling to start their own small businesses and enterprises. It will benefit every single American. As President John F. Kennedy said so memorably so long ago of the capital gains tax reduction he advocated, a rising tide lifts all boats.

By reducing the rate at which we tax capital, we will unleash an energy in this country that will raise the tide of economic prosperity, and I am proud to author this American Dream Tax Relief Act of 2003.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEMINT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ROHRABACHER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FLAKE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. RUSH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IRAQ AND THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the America I envision seeks world unity instead of unilateralism. It gains its power through being the first to help, not the first to strike. It extends itself to the peoples of the world to lift their

burden. It is an America which, when asked for help, dispenses bread instead of bombs, medical assistance instead of missiles, and food instead of fissile materials.

□ 2145

There is a role for America in the world. It is in working with the community of nations to achieve the security of all nations. It is in restoring the promise of the nonproliferation treaty to lead the way to get rid of all nuclear weapons. It is through strengthening and abiding by international treaties. It is in assuring control and eventual elimination of chemical and biological weapons and land mines. It is in protecting our global climate.

America can help protect the world. America can help save the world. But America cannot control the world, nor should we want to do so.

Yet our administration would project American power for the purpose of domination. Their national security doctrines call for America to strike anywhere it pleases and to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

Our Nation is now poised to go to all-out war against Iraq. Iraq has not committed any act of aggression against the United States. Iraq was not responsible for 9/11. No credible evidence exists linking Iraq to Al Qaeda's role in 9/11. Iraq as not responsible for the anthrax attack on our Nation. The United Nations has yet to establish that Iraq has usable weapons of mass destruction. There is no intelligence that Iraq has the ability to strike at the United States. According to the CIA, Iraq has no intention to attack America, but will defend itself if attacked.

Why then is our Nation prepared to send 300,000 of our young men and women into house-to-house combat in the streets of Baghdad? Why is our Nation prepared to spend \$200 billion or more of our hard-earned tax dollars for the destruction of Iraq?

Why is our Nation preparing to use the most powerful military machine in history to wage an assault on the people of Iraq, to destroy their houses and buildings, to wipe out their water and electrical systems, and to block their access to food and medical supplies? There is no answer that can separate itself from oil economics, profit requirements of arms trade, or distorted notions of empire building.

War with Iraq is wrong. But if war is prosecuted further in Iraq, we must be prepared to advance the cause of peace in this country. We must be prepared to stand up, to speak out, to organize, to march, to demand an end to the war, or to demand an end to an administration which insists on war.

It is urgent we oppose this war. It will dominate our Nation's priorities. It will threaten Social Security and Medicare and block a prescription drug benefit for the elderly. It will stop America from providing jobs for all, health care for all, education for all.

There are some who believe that it is unpatriotic to challenge the adminis-

tration on the war. They believe it is politically wiser to debate the economy. But how can one reasonably separate war from the budget, war from the economy, war from America's ability to meet the needs of the people of this Nation?

The administration's own top economic adviser said the war would cost up to \$200 billion. Our Federal budget is already close to huge tax cuts for the wealthy. Remember when we had a budget surplus?

Each time the administration talks about war, fear is created and when fear goes up, the market goes down. War will mean a sharp increase in oil prices, which will hurt jobs in manufacturing and transportation. One economic study with a worst-case scenario puts the cost of an all-out war plus long-term occupation of Iraq at \$1.6 trillion.

We cannot separate war from the economy. We cannot separate war from America's ability to meet the needs of her own people here at home.

We need to ask the questions: Why does America have hundreds of billions to ruin the health and take the lives of innocent people in Iraq but no money to provide health care for all Americans? Would why America spend hundreds of billions to retire Saddam Hussein, but no money to protect the retirement security of its own people? Why does America have money to blow up bridges over the Euphrates River in Iraq, but no money to build bridges over the Cuyahoga River in Cleveland, Ohio?

The path America must take is one of peace that leads to prosperity. It is one which understands that creating a structure of peace ensures that economic structures can be sound, affirmative of human needs and restorative of human values.

This is the dream of a Department of Peace to making nonviolence an organizing principle in our society, making the work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a reality, and working to make war itself a thing of the past. It is the ethic of peace building which will cause us to take down weapons from the heavens and work to create a heaven on Earth.

Peace and prosperity shall be as two pillars in a newly rebuilt America which provides for the economic and Social Security of its own people as a cause of nationhood and for the economic and social progress of people of other lands as a cause of brotherhood.

This confirmation of the purpose of Nation was the dream of Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal, Lyndon Johnson and the Great Society, and John F. Kennedy and the New Frontier. This shall continue to be our dream in the days ahead, that no matter the darkness, we shall hold up the light of America's higher purpose which calls to us across the ages from Washington, Jefferson and Adams, through Lincoln to the present day. Our Nation has a higher calling.

[Ceremonial Swearing-In Jan. 5, 2003,
Cleveland, Ohio]

IRAQ AND THE ECONOMY

(By Rep. Dennis J. Kucinich)

The America I envision seeks world unity instead of unilateralism. It gains its power through being the first to help, not the first to strike. It extends itself to the peoples of the world to life their burden. It is an America, which when asked for help, dispenses bread instead of bombs, medical assistance instead of missiles, and food instead of fissile materials.

There is a role for America in the world. It is in working with the community of nations to achieve the security of all nations. It is in restoring the promise of the Non Proliferation Treaty to lead the way to get rid of all nuclear weapons. It is through strengthening and abiding by international treaties. It is in assuring control and eventual elimination of biological and chemical weapons, and landmines. It is in protecting our global climate.

America can help protect the world. America can help save the world. But America cannot control the world, nor should we want to do so.

Yet our Administration would project American power for the purpose of domination. The National Security doctrines call for America to strike any where it pleases and to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

Our nation is now poised to go to all-out war against Iraq. Iraq has not committed any act of aggression against the United States. Iraq was not responsible for 911. No credible evidence exists linking Iraq to Al Qaeda's role in 911. Iraq was not responsible for the anthrax attack on our nation. The United Nations has yet to establish that Iraq has usable weapons of mass destruction. There is no intelligence that Iraq has the ability to strike at the United States. According to the CIA, Iraq has no intention to attack America, but will defend itself if attacked.

Why then, is our nation prepared to send three hundred thousand of our young men and women into house to house combat in the streets of Baghdad. Why is our nation prepared to spend \$200 billion or more of our hard-earned tax dollars for destruction of Iraq?

Why is our nation preparing to use the most powerful military machine in history to wage an assault against the people of Iraq, to destroy their houses and buildings, to wipe out their water and electric systems and to block their access to food and medical supplies?

There is no answer which can separate itself from oil economics, profit requirements of arms trade, or distorted notions of empire-building.

War with Iraq is wrong. But if war is prosecuted further in Iraq, we must be prepared to advance the cause of peace in this country. We must be prepared to stand up, to speak out, to organize, to march, to demand an end to the war, or to demand an end to an administration which insists on war.

It is urgent we oppose this war. It will dominate our nation's priorities. It will threaten Social Security. It will threaten Medicare. It will block a prescription drug benefit for the elderly. It will stop America from providing jobs for all, health care for all, education for all.

There are some who believe that it is unpatriotic to challenge the Administration on the war. They believe it is politically wiser to debate the economy. But how can one reasonably separate war from the budget, war from the economy, war from America's ability to meet the needs of the people of this nation?

The Administration's own top economic adviser said the war could cost up to \$200 bil-

lion. Our federal budget is already close to a \$200 billion deficit due to huge tax cuts for the wealthy. Remember when we had a budget surplus?

Each time the administration talks about war, fear is created and when fear goes up, the market goes down. War will mean a sharp increase in oil prices, which will hurt jobs in manufacturing and transportation. One economic study with a worst-case scenario puts the cost of an all-out war, plus long-term occupation of Iraq at \$1.6 trillion.

You cannot separate war from the economy. You cannot separate war from America's ability to meet the needs of our own people here at home.

We need to ask the questions: Why does America have hundreds of billions to ruin the health and take the lives of innocent people in Iraq but no money to provide health care for all Americans?

Why would America spend hundreds of billions to retire Saddam Hussein, but no money to protect the retirement security of its own people?

Why does America have money to blow up bridges over the Euphrates River in Iraq, but no money to build up bridges over the Cuyahoga River in Cleveland?

The path America must take is one of peace which leads to prosperity. It is one which understands that creating a structure of peace ensures that economic structures can be sound, affirmative of human needs and restorative of human values.

This is the dream of a Department of Peace making nonviolence an organizing principle in our society—making the work of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. a reality—working to make war itself a thing of the past. It is this ethic of peace building which will cause us to take down weapons from the heavens and work to create a heaven on earth.

Peace and prosperity shall be as two pillars in a newly rebuilt America which provides for the economic and social security of its own people as a cause of nationhood and for the economic and social progress of peoples of other lands as a cause of brotherhood.

This confirmation of the purpose of nation was the dream of Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal Lyndon Johnson and the Great Society, and John F. Kennedy and the New Frontier. This shall continue to be our dream in the days ahead, that no matter the darkness, we shall holdup the light of America's higher purpose, which calls to us across the age from Washington. Jefferson and Adams through Lincoln to the present day.

Our nation has always had a higher calling, despite the darkness of 911 and the official response to it. It is a calling to maintain the quest for democracy, for freedom and liberty at times of peril as well as in times of peace. That higher calling is our heritage. The words of Francis Scott Key still echo:

"Oh say does that Star Spangled Banner yet wave, o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?" he celebrated the link between freedom and bravery: it takes courage to live in a democracy. It takes courage to stand up to terrorists and maintain basic liberties. It takes courage to lead the way toward global disarmament while some are bent on destruction.

It takes patience to face dictators around the world and not be tempted to bomb them into submission. It takes wisdom to have great power and to make gentle its presence in the world.

And it takes compassion to understand the plight of peoples world wide who themselves are trying to survive, to live out their own humble lives despite having conditions which are challenging or governments which are oppressive.

My friends. This is still your government. You have a right to have a say in how its

destiny is being charted. That right derives from our very Declaration of Independence, which claimed self-governance as a basic right. Government does not just happen in Washington, DC. It is the result of a process that takes place in thousands of cities, villages and townships. It is also a process which also takes place in our hearts, which is brought to life by our love of country, and our love of each other.

VETERANS BEING DENIED HEALTH BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, at a time of pending war, the President has submitted a program to this House referred to as the stimulus package that will direct about \$300 billion to the richest 5 percent of America's citizens, and I would like to place that against further decisions made by this administration which affect America's veterans.

At a time of possible war, at a time when we talk about our admiration for our military and at a time when we verbalize our appreciation for those who have served our country in military service, we are treating our veterans in the most shabby manner.

A case in point, last February the Veterans Administration increased the copayment that veterans must pay for prescription medications by a whopping 350 percent. Now at a time when we find money to give billions to the richest among us, we are nickel and diming America's veterans. Perhaps the most egregious example of how we are shortchanging our veterans is found in a memo that was written on July 19, 2002, a memo that was sent out by the Deputy Under-Secretary for Operations and Management of the Veterans Administration. I would like to read a few comments from that memo. It was sent to all of the health care providers across the country.

It says, "As you are aware, the Veterans Health Administration is currently facing a growing crisis related to the continuing demand for health care services that exceeds our resources. Moreover, actuarial projections indicate a widening gap in the demand versus resource availability." And then the shameful conclusion of this memo, "Therefore, I am directing each network director to ensure that no marketing activities to enroll new veterans occur within your networks." Let me read that sentence again. "I am directing each network director to ensure that no marketing activities to enroll new veterans occur within your networks."

Even though some sites may have local capacity as a national system, all facilities are expected to abide by this policy. Marketing activities may include generalized mailings to veterans, prohibited. Local newspaper or newspaper articles encouraging veterans to

enroll, prohibited, or similar public service announcements. In other words, the policy of the VA is to withhold information from veterans regarding the services that they are legally entitled to.

Now, I call this the new "if they do not ask, we will not tell" policy. If the veterans do not ask what services they are entitled to under the law, the VA policy is that we will not tell them. And, furthermore, we will prohibit our health care providers from reaching out to sick or disabled veterans and telling them what this body has provided under the law for them. This is shameful. I ask how the American people can tolerate and why the administration would institute such a policy that says to America's veterans that they may be entitled to certain services legally, health services, but we are prohibiting. Think of that, we are prohibiting our network providers from giving veterans information that they deserve, that they need to know in order to get the services that they are legally entitled to receive. This is shameful.

I call upon the administration and I call upon those of us who are Members of this body to hold this administration accountable for this shameful act. I wonder how many veterans who have served this country and paid with their health and their bodies understand what this administration is doing to them.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 22) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 22

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following committees:

Committee on Agriculture: Mr. Stenholm of Texas.

Committee on Appropriations: Mr. Obey of Wisconsin.

Committee on Armed Services: Mr. Skelton of Missouri.

Committee on the Budget: Mr. Spratt of South Carolina.

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Mr. George Miller of California.

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Mr. Dingell of Michigan.

Committee on Financial Services: Mr. Frank of Massachusetts.

Committee on Government Reform: Mr. Waxman of California.

Committee on International Relations: Mr. Lantos of California.

Committee on the Judiciary: Mr. Conyers of Michigan.

Committee on Resources: Mr. Rahall of West Virginia.

Committee on Science: Mr. Hall of Texas.

Committee on Small Business: Ms. Velazquez of New York.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Mr. Oberstar of Minnesota.

Committee on Veterans Affairs: Mr. Evans of Illinois.

Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. Rangel of New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 23) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 23

Resolved, That the following Member be, and is hereby, elected to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct:

Mr. BERMAN of California.

The resolution was agreed to.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, today we have successfully debated and passed a bill to provide an extension of unemployment benefits to millions of Americans who find themselves out of work. This is a laudable activity for us to be involved with and I was proud to be able to support that particular piece of legislation.

I find, however, that we are soon going to be debating another piece of legislation that is referred to as an economic stimulus package, and during the course of that debate we will undoubtedly be talking about the number of jobs that need to be created in the United States in order for our economy to get moving again. All of these things I support and I believe need to be done, but I also believe that there is something which has been left out of the equation and left out of the discussion when it comes to jobs and providing economic benefits for American citizens. I underline the word "citizens" because what has happened over the course of the last decade is that we have allowed into this country, illegally we have allowed into this country between 8 and 13 million people. We do not know for sure, of course, because they came without our permission. They came across the borders. We are told that they are here working and taking jobs no other Americans would take.

Mr. Speaker, I get many, many letters from people in my district who are out of work and they tell me that they would take any job available to them. There are steelworkers out of work, factory workers up and down the East Coast, all across the rust belt, these people are willing to take any job

available; but, of course, other people have gotten there before them. But, who are these people? Up to 13 million of them are people who are not citizens of this country.

□ 2200

We import them. Of course it is true that many businesses hire people who are here illegally, even knowingly hire people who are here illegally because they believe they will work for less, they will work under conditions that perhaps other people would not. We take advantage of many people. They are oftentimes manipulated by unscrupulous employers once they get here.

This is all bad, it is all illegal, but we ignore it and we suggest that we have to do something else to provide jobs for people who are here. But why do we not look at the fact that if we secure our own borders, if we ask people who are here illegally to return to their country of origin, that we would immediately provide millions of jobs for American citizens? Only we would not have to spend another dollar; we would not have to appropriate any more money.

Today it was 7 or \$8 billion for the extension of unemployment benefits, but doing what I ask, and that is to secure our borders, to identify people who are here illegally and deport them. This does not really cost all that much. That is what the Federal Government should be doing. That is our role and responsibility, to secure the border, to know who is coming into this country, for how long and for what purpose. We choose not to do that. We choose not to do that because there are political implications there, and there are political ramifications of such a decision. If we were to actually defend our own borders and control the process so that people coming into this country would do so in a legal process, we would, of course, diminish the flow of illegal immigrants. That would upset the Democrats because they would say that this would impede their ability to gain potential voters, knowing that many immigrants, especially illegal immigrants, would flock to the Democratic Party.

On the other hand, we have the Republican Party which says that if we were to secure our own borders, if we were to stop the flow of illegal immigrants into the country, that would impede the ability of businesses to hire cheap labor. Both of these reasons are, I think, bogus. They do not reflect what we should be doing in this body and, that is, to uphold the law. We should be demanding that the INS, we should be demanding that this administration uphold the law and that we address the issue of border patrol, increasing border patrol and also putting the military on the border which is absolutely necessary in order for us to achieve any degree of security on our borders and on our coastline. That is imperative. But we refuse to do it. We are fearful of doing it.

At the same time, there have been attempts on this floor, there have been attempts in this body to provide amnesty for people who are here illegally, to reward people who have come here illegally and give them the opportunities that are usually provided for people who have gone through the process, who have spent the time, who have spent the money, who have had the brain damage of having to go through sometimes years of bureaucratic wrangling to come into the country legally. They have waited in line. They have done it the right way. But we keep proposing to give people who have broken the law, who have snuck into the country, we keep proposing to give them amnesty. What does that concept tell everybody who has done it the right way? It tells them that they were essentially suckers and that they should have simply snuck into the country, we would eventually give them amnesty and they would get all the benefits that anyone here legally would enjoy.

Speaking of those benefits, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about another phenomenon that is going on throughout the country. There is a process, something called the matricula consular. This is a card, an identification card that is being handed out by the Mexican Government to Mexican nationals in the United States.

THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to follow up to some extent on the comments made by my Republican colleague from Colorado. I know he mentioned that today the House passed a Republican-sponsored bill that would provide an additional 13 weeks of extended unemployment benefits to workers who had exhausted their benefits. But I have to say that this proposal did not go far enough. We know that the economy is in a significant downturn, there are many people who have exhausted their unemployment benefits, who would not be able to continue to receive benefits under the Republican proposal, and also the Republican proposal is for a relatively short period of time, 13 weeks, as opposed to the 26 weeks that had been proposed by the Democrats.

Basically what they agreed to today, the Republicans, was to pass a bill that would provide 13 weeks of extended unemployment benefits in every State during the first 5 months of 2003. However, even now the Republicans still refuse to provide any additional assistance to the 1 million workers who exhausted their 13 weeks of extended benefits last year but who remain unemployed.

During the last recession in the early 1990s, these workers were provided 26

weeks of benefits; but this time they only received 13 weeks. Furthermore, there is \$25 billion in the Federal unemployment trust funds, more than enough to both continue the extended benefits program this year and help exhaustees from the last year. Unemployment compensation goes to the families who must spend it very quickly, meaning it acts as an economic stimulus. Economists have estimated that each dollar of unemployment benefits leads to \$2.15 in economic growth.

I mention this because I think that to some extent people are going to read now that the Republicans passed this bill and say, that is great, we are going to have some more extended weeks of unemployment benefits, but the fact of the matter is a lot of people will not receive the benefits who really need it and it is for a relatively short period of time. The Democrats have said, of course, that we would go 26 weeks, to the end of June, and we would include all of those who have exhausted their benefits, the 1 million or so from last year who would get an additional 13 weeks under the Democratic proposal.

The other thing, though, that was very upsetting to me today was not only that we did not go far enough in terms of unemployment benefits in what we finally passed here in the House but also even as President Bush announced his economic stimulus plan, which I do not think is an economic stimulus plan at all and I will go into that a little bit, it was announced as part of it that the effect on the deficit over the next 10 years would be about 674, \$675 billion.

We know that we are already back into a serious deficit problem this year, about \$150 billion. After having several years under President Clinton when we actually had a surplus, now we are back into a deficit situation. And what President Bush proposes in his economic package will cost a tremendous amount of money and not necessarily put anybody back to work, not create the very stimulus that he claims to be talking about. But an important part of that is that it is going to put us so much further into debt, to the tune of something like \$674 billion.

But what did I hear? Instead of reacting the way the Democrats said and saying let us have a real economic stimulus plan that actually does something and does not cost that much because the Democrats are at just a little over \$100 billion, what we are hearing from the Republican side of the aisle is that this economic plan of the President's is not big enough, is not going to put us enough in deficit. In fact, we have the majority leader, the Republican majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) saying that he wants to boost the size of the Bush tax cut package. He is actually quoted in Congress Daily saying today that the Republicans, the House Republicans would move quickly to pass most of President Bush's 10-year \$674 billion tax cut proposal, and they would likely

increase the total size of the package. This is a quote: "The House will pass a bill that will have all the tax relief that is in the President's bill and probably more," Mr. DELAY said, adding, "I see the President's package as a floor, not a ceiling."

Obviously, what the gentleman from Texas is trying to do is counteract the statements being made by the Democrats that the President's plan is not only ineffective as a stimulus but is also going to put us seriously into debt by suggesting, "Oh, don't worry about that, I'll come up with an even bigger one." It is scary to think what the Republicans are thinking about in the House. They seem to be just perfectly willing to rubber-stamp whatever the President does and then go even further in terms of putting us into debt and doing something that is not going to be very effective for the American people.

Why do I say it is not effective? Why do I say the President's plan that was announced yesterday is not effective as a stimulus package, that it is not going to do anything to put people back to work, that it is not going to do anything to improve the economy? If you look at it, the centerpiece of the President's plan is the complete elimination of all taxes on stock dividends. If you think about it, not only is that primarily going to benefit the wealthy instead of putting back money into the hands of the average American, but what guarantee is it that if you give this windfall essentially to people who have dividends, stock dividends, that they are going to invest it back in the economy and create jobs? We have no guarantee that the stock market is going to go up because of it. We have no guarantee that whatever savings are made are going to be reinvested in new means of production or creating new jobs. This is just speculation. And to say that the centerpiece of your plan is such a speculative proposal and to put us into debt so much more over the next 10 years is just, I think, totally irresponsible.

According to a preliminary estimate by the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, 45 percent of the benefits of the entire Bush proposal will go to the top 5 percent of taxpayers who have an average income of \$350,000. In fact, those making over \$1 million will see an average tax break of \$88,000, more than 100 times the tax cut for the vast majority of taxpayers making less than \$75,000. Let me also add, when I talk about this budget deficit that is going to be increased by 6 to \$700 billion under the Bush plan, keep in mind that the President also said when he announced his proposal that he also wanted to make the tax cuts of last year permanent, which would probably double the amount of deficit. You could probably double that 6 to \$700 billion figure and go up to, say, 1.4, \$1.5 trillion, not to count the debt service that you would have on that. By the time it is all said and done, the thing that the President

proposed or said he wanted to do yesterday not only in this initial so-called stimulus plan but also long term in terms of making the tax cuts permanent that were put into law last year, we would probably be talking about a \$2 trillion deficit. We are going to go back to the worst of times that we have ever seen in terms of deficit. The consequence to the economy will be dismal. The impact in terms of creating even more of a downward trend on the economy from that kind of budget deficit is really incredible.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk a little bit about the Democratic alternative, and basically the Democratic alternative is radically different from what President Bush has proposed because it is based on certain very sound principles. First of all, it says that any economic stimulus plan should be front-loaded and fast-acting. The benefits have to accrue to the American people this year, in 2003. It has got to create jobs. It has got to put money in their pockets. It has to put money back to the States so that they can bail themselves out of some of the deficit problems that they have. It should also avoid mushrooming the deficit in the long term. The Democratic proposal basically is targeted towards 2003 and over the 10-year period would only create an additional deficit of about \$100 billion.

I think you could make a legitimate argument that the economy would grow enough to make up for that \$100 billion because it is front-loaded and fast-acting. It would also boost consumer demand and investment because it would say that some money is going to go directly into consumers' pockets and some money is going to be given back to small businesses so that they can invest here and would be forced to invest here rather than take their stock dividends overseas or put them in some other country.

Also the Democratic plan would help States through their fiscal straits. We know that so many States, my home State of New Jersey we estimate maybe a 4, \$5 billion deficit that has to be overcome. Let the Federal Government help out a little bit with that. And also we are investing in infrastructure primarily by funding homeland defense, airport security, security for other infrastructure around the country.

But I think the most important thing, and I do not want to keep repeating myself, is the fact that under the Democratic proposal we are basically doing something that makes a difference now in this next year. I should say in this year, 2003.

Let me just briefly run through what the Democrats are proposing. We have a middle-class tax cut that basically gives a refundable tax cut. It is 10 percent of your taxes up to about \$600 for a couple, structured to include those who pay payroll taxes. Basically it is going to be structured in a way that you get a rebate of up to \$300 for an in-

dividual or up to \$600 for a couple. We have business tax incentives to encourage investment so that the investment has to be here in the United States, this year. And we have assistance to the States including money for infrastructure and also to help States defray the cost of Medicaid, which is a big part of the reason why so many of them are in a deficit situation. And I mentioned the unemployment compensation benefits would be much more extensive than what the Republicans proposed today and passed today.

I just wanted to say a little bit, a little commentary by some of the media. The media in the editorials that I have read have essentially panned the Republican proposal and said that the Democratic proposal would be much better and really make a difference in terms of economic growth. I just wanted to read some excerpts, if I could, just from two New York Times editorials and op-eds that were in the paper yesterday. This one is by Paul Krugman, it was in yesterday's paper, just to give you some highlights of it. He is talking about a sensible plan: "A sensible economic stimulus plan would provide immediate, large-scale aid to beleaguered State governments, which have been burdened with expensive homeland security mandates even as their revenues have plunged. Given our long-run budget problem, any tax relief would be temporary and go largely to low- and middle-income families."

□ 2215

"Yesterday House Democrats released a plan right out of the textbook: aid to States and the jobless, rebates to everyone. But the centerpiece of the administration's proposal" by contrast "is the permanent elimination of taxes on dividends."

"So instead of a temporary measure, we get a permanent tax cut. The price tag of the overall plan is a whopping \$600 billion; yet less than \$100 billion will arrive in the first year. The Democratic plan, with an overall price tag of only \$136 billion actually provides more short-term stimulus."

"And instead of helping the needy, the Bush plan is almost ludicrously tilted towards the very, very well off. If you have stocks in a 401(k), your dividends are already tax sheltered; this proposal gives big breaks only to people who have lots of stock outside their retirement accounts. More than half the benefits will go to people making more than \$200,000 per year."

I could go on and on but I think the point is well made. The Democratic proposal is a real stimulus package. It does not increase the deficit in a significant way. It gives money back to the average American. It is primarily skewed to help the average guy. The Republican proposal is primarily for the rich. It does not do anything short term, and it leads to an even greater deficit, worse than the one that we have right now. But the House Republicans are going to say they are going

to push this and Mr. DELAY has already said that he wants to do an even bigger one; so we will just have to continue the fight.

At this time I see the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is here, and I have probably spoken long enough and I would like to yield time to her on the same subject.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for yielding.

This month marks the beginning of the third year of the Bush recession, and I would like to say that even if the Clinton administration is being blamed, it is on this administration's watch that these things are occurring. Across the Nation workers continue to lose their jobs on this watch. Nationwide 800,000 laid-off workers lost their benefits on December 28, and I appreciate the 13-week expansion that was signed today, but I think 26 weeks would have been more likely, more acceptable, and make a better difference.

In my own State, the State of California, our budget deficit has mushroomed to 35 billion, with a "b," dollars, while unemployment has risen by 6.5 percent, and that is only those that can be counted who are still in the system. Many have dropped out of the system, do not even report for unemployment, do not even report seeking jobs. They are just out there on the streets. So I am sure in my district this number would be higher.

As millions of people are out of work and the economy continues in a weak and jobless recovery at its best, it is important to have a strong and immediate economic program that will put money in the hands of consumers now. I am sorry to say that this administration has been more consumed with initiating a war than it has been with initiating a domestic economic policy that will benefit this country and make it stronger in defending against those who would attack us.

Earlier this week the President announced his plan to deal with this slow economy. Why were we not talking about it last year? Why did we have to go through the Christmas holidays with parents wondering if they could afford to buy gifts for their children? Are parents wondering if they can keep shelter, keep a roof over their heads? We knew the economy had slowed, but it was just this week that finally the administration awakened. This was the President's chance to ask Congress for real job-creating plans, to immediately address the economic problems faced by that working class ordinary Americans. Instead, the President chose to stick with more of the same tax schemes that he tried last year.

I wonder if anyone noticed except me that in September a year ago when the tax cut plan was passed that we saw more bankruptcies, corporate misconduct was revealed, and we were in a mess. We saw the jobless rate grow. Now, if the tax cut was meant to stimulate investments in business, it had

the opposite effect, and I would be truly concerned if I were the administrator why there were so many bankruptcies when we gave a tax break to corporate America. What happened? I think I know. All we need to do is watch any program that deals with wealth and the wealthy in this country. We will see that they are building larger homes in exotic places, 3,800 square foot homes for these executives of these companies that have gone bankrupt, larger yachts, are buying more business but not employing more people. Some of the biggest corporations cut staff, pare down. Somebody ought to explain that. These policies were skewed to favor these same wealthy Americans, and to think that we have a homeland security proposal that allows a lot of these business owners to escape paying their fair taxes and run to other exotic places to hide their companies I think is un-American. His plan will blow an even bigger hole in the budget and threaten economic growth, and only 15 percent of the Bush package will take effect this year, meaning that most of the economic impact of the program would not be felt until 2004 and thereafter. The centerpiece of the plan, the complete elimination of taxes on stock dividends, and think for a second, many of the people I represent do not know what a stock dividend is. Investing dollars? Are we kidding? They are trying to pay their rent. They are trying to pay their house notes. They are trying to send their children to college if they can even get through elementary, middle school, and high school. They are trying to keep their families together. So they are not the ones that are going to feel any benefit from the elimination of these taxes. And they say it will benefit the seniors. Certainly I think today when you get 50 years old you can claim being a senior, and certainly the guys and gals who have made the big money are in their 60's and they can sit back with all this money flowing in because they do not have taxes to pay. It certainly will benefit them, but it certainly will not get to the people that really make up the core of America. So it primarily benefits this elite class, the wealthy, instead of putting money in the hands of the hard-working Americans who keep this country going.

According to preliminary estimates of the Nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, 45 percent of the benefits of the entire Bush proposal would go, and now get this, do not take my word for it, check it out yourself, but the benefit will go to the top 5 percent of taxpayers who have an average income of \$350,000. In fact, those making over a million dollars will see an average tax break of \$88,000-plus, more than a hundred times the tax cut for the vast majority of taxpayers making less than \$75,000. Do not take my figures. Do the math. Be analytical in your thinking. Look at the President's proposal and see who fits the description of the provisions in it.

As the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office concluded last year, tax cuts that are targeted towards lower income households are likely to generate more stimulus dollar for dollar of revenue loss, that is, be more cost effective and have more bang for the buck, than those concentrated among higher income households. This is because higher income families are less likely to put that money back into the economy by spending it. So by targeting their tax cuts on the wealthy, the Bush administration has undermined its stimulus effect. Look what happened with the last tax cut.

Furthermore, the Bush plan would worsen the current budget deficits. Anybody concerned about deficits today? I remember several years ago they were. But the Bush plan would worsen the current budget deficits that have ballooned since the Bush administration took over. Check it out. The Bush plan would increase the deficit by nearly \$700 billion over 10 years, and I do not think there is any argument over that. We are dealing with concrete numbers. Not only does this threaten key investments like Social Security and Medicare, this growth in deficits would promote higher interest rates and threaten to worsen the economy instead of spurring economic growth. Where is the concern of current Republicans? And I remember under the Newt Gingrich era, they were very concerned about deficit. Maybe it is amnesia.

Democrats have put forth an alternative stimulus plan, one that delivers a real immediate boost for our economy. The House Democratic alternative, economic stimulus package, is fast acting, fair, and fiscally responsible. Does anyone care about fiscal responsibility, or is it smoke and mirrors? It focuses on jump-starting the economy now and quickly moving the United States to a long-term growth agenda. It does not deceive people. It does not make people buy this fluff and try to feel good about it when it is not real. Our package is.

The Democratic economic stimulus plan aimed at those who need it most avoids increasing the deficit and helps States that are deeply suffering through this recession. Not only California but across this country, States are suffering. We ought to have the governors in here to debate these proposals. The Democratic plan will immediately target \$18 billion to extend unemployment benefits for laid-off workers who have already exhausted their claims and in addition provide more needed relief to cash strapped States and localities. The Democratic plan also provides immediate tax relief for small businesses to generate investment and jobs. It allocates additional funds for transportation, homeland security, healthcare, and extends unemployment benefits for workers whose insurance has run out and who have been unable to find jobs. The plan also puts money in the hands of consumers who drive the economy by giving a \$300

tax rebate to every working American and also \$600 for couples. Unlike the Republican tax plan which favors the wealthy by providing tax cuts on stock dividends and does little to grow the economy, the Democrats' stimulus package focuses tax cuts on lower and middle class taxpayers and actually will cost less than Republican plan.

□ 2230

In addition, the Democratic plan will spur the economy by providing funding for homeland security. Let us make America secure on the real side that targets rebuilding our Nation's long-neglected infrastructure. Most importantly, the Democratic plan is fiscally responsive and fair. It provides the proper amount of targeted economic stimulus and, at the same time, will not impact the budget deficit.

So in closing, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss the two plans and to give some real numbers and real figures. I represent one of those States that is sorely in need of help. But of the \$35 billion deficit, that is with a "B," we cannot cut enough and we cannot raise enough taxes to fill in that gap. We need to put America back to work. We need to put Californians back to work. We need to generate real jobs.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her remarks. Obviously, she really set forth the differences between what the Democrats are trying to do with our economic stimulus plan versus the President and the Republicans' plans, which I do not think, and the gentlewoman agrees, that the President's and the Republican plan is really going to make a difference for the economy. It is just sort of a way of getting more tax cuts, more of the same, primarily to the wealthy and to corporate interests. It is almost like they are using the need for a stimulus plan as an excuse to basically continue the same old policies of more and more tax cuts for the wealthy, which have failed.

One of the things that bothers me a great deal, and the gentlewoman hit upon it, is the fact that we still hear, although we do not hear it so much, but for a while we were hearing the Republicans say, oh, this recession really started under President Clinton, as if somehow the Democrats brought about the recession. The gentlewoman and I know, and the facts show, that we had the greatest, or one of the greatest, I think probably the greatest economic growth in the 10 years from 1991 to the end of President Clinton's term in 2001 or the very beginning of 2001, the greatest economic expansion the country has ever seen. All of a sudden, in March of 2001, 3 months into President Bush's term, we start to see the economic downturn.

I had actually mentioned the other night, and this is from the National Bureau of Economic Research Business Cycle Dating Committee, and maybe it

is sort of a minor point, but I only mention it because I see our Republican colleagues saying the opposite. And in this research, it says, "In November 2001, the Committee determined that a peak in business activity occurred in the U.S. in March of 2001. A peak marks the end of an expansion and the beginning of a recession. The determination of a peak date in March is thus a determination that the expansion that began in March of 1991 ended in March 2001 and a recession began in March of 2001."

The recession began, as the gentlewoman said, under President Bush's watch. Regardless of that, it has gotten worse. It gets worse every day. I have to say that I am very concerned that if we put in place this Republican economic plan and we continue the same-old-same-old policies of more tax cuts for the wealthy, that we are probably going to be in a worse situation in a few months than we even are today. I do not want to see that happen, but it is very possible.

The other thing that really galls me too, and the gentlewoman brought it up, and the gentlewoman remembers and I remember it even more because I have been here longer is how the Republicans, before they took the majority here in the House under Gingrich, used to get on this floor and rail and rail and rail almost every night about the deficit and how the deficit was getting worse and getting worse all the time. There was one guy I remember, do I not know if he is still here, I do not think he is, who used to have one of the pages bring this sort of clock, digital clock that literally extended almost the entire length of this podium where I am standing, and every night he would come here and do a 1-minute or a 5-minute, and he would see the clock number going up with the higher and higher deficit. That was the centerpiece. The whole theme of the Republicans at the time was how terrible this deficit is.

What happened? How come all of a sudden we do not see the guy with the clock anymore? I think he may have left Congress. But we do not see anybody on the Republican side coming down here. In fact, the other day the President said we should not worry about the deficit; it is no big deal. We will grow out of it. We should expect it. We are going to have this problem. It is just some kind of regular business cycle or something. It was ridiculous. I just appreciate the gentlewoman's comments.

The other thing that the gentlewoman mentioned that I think was so important is this sort of notion of shared sacrifice or caring about the future generations in a time of war, and I think that is what the gentlewoman said, and she may want to dwell on it a little more, that in a time of war, the idea was that we sacrificed. We have a war against terrorism, we may have a war against Iraq, who knows, in the next few weeks or months. So why in

the middle of all this are we getting this tax cut plan that primarily helps wealthy individuals and corporate interests? Why are they not paying their share, if you will, of the cost of this war? Why is there not a shared sacrifice? Why does it always have to be on the backs of the little guy, the average guy? It never used to be that way. It seems to me to be an opportunity for the President to get up and say, we have a potential war, we are in a war against terrorists, essentially, and it is costing us more money. I really do not understand the whole philosophy. It really baffles the mind.

There was an article, there was an op-ed in The Washington Post actually today that essentially made that point. It was an analysis by Jonathan Weisman, and it is entitled, "War's Cost May Dwarf Stimulus Effect." Essentially what he said in this opinion page is that we really should not be dealing with any kind of major tax cuts or any kind of a plan that causes a major deficit problem, because we might have a tremendous expense from the war with Iraq, and that the impact of that would create such a large deficit and have such a downward effect on the economy that this is not the time to be playing with a huge tax package, with a huge long-term tax package that has the potential for greater debt, and we should only be doing something, essentially, I mean, to counteract that; we should only be doing something like the Democrats are proposing which is quick, which is one year and does not have any major impact on the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I promised to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for procedural matters.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 24) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 24

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected chairmen of the following standing committees:

Committee on Agriculture: Mr. Goodlatte of Virginia.

Committee on Appropriations: Mr. Young of Florida.

Committee on Armed Services: Mr. Hunter of California.

Committee on the Budget: Mr. Nussle of Iowa.

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Mr. Boehner of Ohio.

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Mr. Tauzin of Louisiana.

Committee on Financial Services: Mr. Oxley of Ohio.

Committee on Government Reform: Mr. Tom Davis of Virginia.

Committee on House Administration: Mr. Ney of Ohio.

Committee on International Relations: Mr. Hyde of Illinois.

Committee on the Judiciary: Mr. Sensenbrenner of Wisconsin.

Committee on Resources: Mr. Pombo of California.

Committee on Science: Mr. Boehlert of New York.

Committee on Small Business: Mr. Manzullo of Illinois.

Committee on Standards of Official Conduct: Mr. Hefley of Colorado.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Mr. Young of Alaska.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Mr. Chris Smith of New Jersey.

Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. Thomas of California.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPOSITION OF MEMBERS OF THE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the requirement of clause 11(a)(1) of Rule X, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence be composed of not more than 20 Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner, of whom not more than 11 be from the same party.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to clause 11 of rule XX and clause 11 of rule I, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. GOSS, Florida, Chairman,

Mr. BEREUTER, Nebraska,

Mr. BOEHLERT, New York,

Mr. GIBBONS, Nevada,

Mr. LAHOOD, Illinois,

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, California,

Mr. HOEKSTRA, Michigan,

Mr. BURR, North Carolina,

Mr. EVERETT, Alabama,

Ms. HARMAN, California,

Mr. HASTINGS, Florida,

Mr. REYES, Texas,

Mr. BOSWELL, Iowa,

Mr. PETERSON, Minnesota,

Mr. CRAMER, Alabama,

Ms. ESHOO, California,

Mr. HOLT, New Jersey,

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mr. SAXTON, New Jersey.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. MAC THORNBERRY OR HON. ROY BLUNT TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH JANUARY 27, 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 8, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MAC THORNBERRY or, if not available to perform

this duty, the Honorable ROY BLUNT to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through January 27, 2003.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF
THE TWO HOUSES

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 8) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 8

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Wednesday, January 8, 2003, Thursday, January 9, 2003, or Friday, January 10, 2003, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, January 27, 2003, or until Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, January 9, 2003, through Friday, January 24, 2003, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE TO
FRIDAY, JANUARY 10, 2003

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Friday, January 10, 2003, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 8, in which case the House will stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER, MAJORITY LEADER, AND
MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS
AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS DURING FIRST SES-
SION OF 108TH CONGRESS

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the first session of the 108th Congress, the Speaker and majority leader and minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. Speaker, I do intend now to wrap up the evening. I want to thank the gentlewoman from California again for coming down here and for the remarks that she made. I just wanted to, if I could, just briefly summarize or make some of the points that were made in this Washington Post opinion by Jonathan Weisman about the cost of the war and the impact of the war, because I think that as much as the gentlewoman and I are hoping that there is not going to be a war and that somehow we manage to peacefully resolve the situation in Iraq, the bottom line is it is hovering over us.

□ 2245

We know that a lot of troops have already been sent over there, that a lot of supplies have already been sent there, and that there is a real possibility that this could occur in the next few weeks.

I just wanted to read some sections, if I could, of Mr. Weisman's opinion. He said, "President Bush is plowing ahead with an ambitious 10-year, \$674 billion economic stimulus plan even as U.S. troops pour into the Persian Gulf region preparing for war.

"The president's determination to push more tax cuts as the nation prepares for war has struck some economists as folly, since the economic shock of war would likely dwarf the impact of Bush's stimulus plan."

It says, "The Cost to the Treasury of a war with Iraq could be as low as \$100 billion over the next decade or as high as \$1.6 trillion."

"If energy prices spike up, it wouldn't take much to offset all of this stimulus." It goes on to say, "If the war lasted even 6 to 12 weeks, stock prices would continue to fall, interest rates would rise and economic growth would slow by 1¾ percent."

"The best policy right now is to wait, to see what happens ahead, and to plan in the background some contingency plans, just in case we have an adverse outcome." "But for the President's critics the timing and boldness of the Bush plan presents a target," and of course this is what we have been saying. "Whenever the President talks about war, he talks about a spirit of shared sacrifice; but for rich people, shared sacrifice appears to be accepting tax cuts, and for the poor, it seems to be accepting cuts in social spending."

Then we have a quote from one of our favorite Members, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL). He says, and I think it is very appropriate, and he is, of course, the ranking member on our tax-writing committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, he says, "Never in

a time of war have we reduced the tax burden on the most privileged." That is basically what is going on here.

I think if we listen to what Mr. Weisman says, he is basically saying that this plan is too ambitious, and it is so long-term and has such an impact on the deficit that it is folly, given what we might face in a potential war against Iraq.

If we look at the Democratic plan, it is much smaller. It has only just a little over \$100 billion impact over 10 years, and it is targeted to small businesses so we invest in new proposals, new job creation here at home.

We give a tax rebate, a relatively small one, to consumers, up to \$600 for a couple, to try to get the economy going quickly. But the bottom line is, we do not do anything long-term to have a major impact on the deficit, and we are spending a relatively small amount of money with a big impact over the short term. So I think that that plan fits into the potential if you have a conflict or a war.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to request from the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) if we can do a side-by-side chart on the cost of waging war in Iraq. I understand we have several thousand troops already over in the Middle East, and possibly the dispute with North Korea might require us to commit dollars.

I would like to see a chart with the cost of war and the cost of nationbuilding if we are trying to create a new regime. What is our commitment going to be to this new regime that we have called for? I can tell the Members from my own experience as the ambassador to the Federated States of Micronesia, they were a trust territory until 1986. In 1986, we signed a compact of free association with them that was to last 15 years. It has cost us \$5 billion, and we are getting ready to sign on another 20 years.

Now, I saw taxpayers' dollars go into the ocean. I was there. I knew. We had to close down some programs because that money was going into people's pockets, and into building homes for the very wealthy and the families of the very wealthy. We were not monitoring it.

I came back here many times saying, give me not only audits but oversight and follow-up; get the FBI out here, because our money is being taken. I could not get anyone to listen. I left; the problem got worse. Ask the current ambassador.

What is going to happen in Afghanistan in the long run and in Iraq in the long run? We talked about the axis of evil, so let us talk about Iran, too, and let us talk about North Korea. We did not say that; the President stood on this floor and talked about the axis of evil. Getting rid of the evil means changing those who are running those countries now. What is our obligation as Congress, as the Federal Government, and taxpayers? All this has to be

taken into consideration in terms of the proposed tax cuts.

If we talk about homeland security, how do we secure our own home if we cannot even educate our children, if we cannot even improve our infrastructure, if we cannot set out a budget for first responders? In my own city of Los Angeles we only have 9,000 police officers, as compared to Giuliani's New York with 30,000. We have 2 million people.

So are we sincere about protecting our homeland? That means not the home land, that means America's people. What is our plan for seriously doing that? I just wanted to put that out as we go about looking at the budget. I think it is very important to be heard. That is why I said it.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate it. Mr. Speaker, I think it all goes back to the same thing, which is as the Democrats we are talking about a short-term 2003 plan that does not spend a lot of money relatively and put the government in deficit, and that is specifically directed to jumpstart the economy.

But what the President and the Republicans have proposed does not really even address the short-term economic needs in order to turn the economy around. It is just a long-range plan to basically provide more tax cuts for wealthy people: the stock dividends; the proposal to make the tax cuts permanent in another 10 years.

If we look at that in the context of what the budget needs are, as the gentlewoman says, in this war on terrorism both at home or abroad, we have to wonder where all this money is going to come from and what the consequences are going to be in terms of the deficit.

Ms. WATSON. We are cutting our revenue base, and we are fighting a war over 10,000 miles away that we really do not need to fight, we really do not need to fight.

Mr. PALLONE. I have been hesitating to talk about whether the war is just or necessary, but I think the bottom line is if it is going to be fought or whether it is going to be fought, we have to think about the costs of it. This President's economic plan makes absolutely no sense in the context of whether it is a war against Iraq or the other axis of evil, or just the war against terrorism and homeland security. It really does not.

Ms. WATSON. Let me say, we are a member of the United Nations. We went to the Security Council. They have their inspectors out there. If they do not find what they are looking for, it needs to go back to the Security Council.

We are working on an assumption, and North Korea says, we have your bomb. The monies that we give them for food and so on, does it really get to the people? If it did, why do we have such massive starvation over in North Korea? And I do not see why we are treating them any differently than we are treating Iraq.

Where is our commitment? How do we secure the United States? A country is only as strong as its people, and we cannot let the general public forget that. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PALLONE. We need to continue. I thank the gentlewoman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KIND (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal business.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KUCINICH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KUCINICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FEENEY of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEMINT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 23. An act to provide for a 5-month extension of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 and for a transition period for individuals receiving compensation when the program under such act ends.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 8 of the 108th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. Friday,

January 10, 2003, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 8, in which case the House shall stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, January 27, 2003, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 8.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 8, 108th Congress, and its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 27, 2003, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

111. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — 2002 Farm Bill Regulations — Marketing Assistance Loans and Loan Deficiency Payments for Peanuts, Pulse Crops, Wheat, Feed Grains, Soybeans and Other Oilseeds (RIN: 0560-AG72) received November 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

112. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticides; Tolerance Exemptions for Active and Inert Ingredients for Use in Antimicrobial Formulations (Food-Contact Surface Sanitizing Solutions) [OPP-2002-0278; FRL-6824-2] received November 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

113. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyriproxyfen; Pesticide Tolerance for Emergency Exemption [OPP-2002-0314; FRL-7281-2] received November 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

114. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyriproxyfen Sodium (sodium 2-chloro-6[(4,6-dimethoxypyrimidin-2-yl)thio]benzoate); Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2002-0005; FRL-7279-5] received November 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

115. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cyromazine; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2002-0237; FRL-7274-8] received December 2, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

116. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his requests for FY 2003 budget amendments for the Departments of Agriculture, Health and Human Services, the Interior, Labor, and the Treasury; the Corps of Engineers; as well as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Federal Trade Commission; (H. Doc. No. 108—18); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

117. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's USTRANSCOM Personal Property Pilot Programs Evaluation Report; to the Committee on Armed Services.

118. A letter from the Deputy Congressional Liaison, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Transactions between

Member Banks and their Affiliates [Regulation W; Docket No. R-1103] received December 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

119. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Australia pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

120. A letter from the Senior Vice President, Congressional Affairs, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting the annual report to Congress on the operations of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for Fiscal Year 2002, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635g(a); to the Committee on Financial Services.

121. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the annual report of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity for Fiscal Year 2002, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1145(e); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

122. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting the annual report on the provision of services to minority and diverse audiences by public broadcasting entities and public telecommunications entities, pursuant to Public Law 100—626, section 9(a) (102 Stat. 3211); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

123. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, "The State Children's Health Insurance Program: A Summary Evaluation of States' Early Experience with SCHIP"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

124. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Primary Drinking Water Regulations: Minor Revisions to Public Notification Rule, Consumer Confidence Report Rule and Primacy Rule [FRL-7413-9] (RIN: 2040-AD06) received November 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

125. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Control of Air Pollution From New Motor Vehicles: Amendments to the Tier 2 Motor Vehicle Emission Regulations [AMS-FRL-7416-7] (RIN: 2060-AI23) received December 2, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

126. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans for Texas: Transportation Control Measures Rule [TX-127-1-7555; FRL-7416-5] received December 2, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

127. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Hampshire; One-hour Ozone Attainment Demonstration for the New Hampshire Portion of the Boston-Lawrence-Worcester, MA-NH Ozone Nonattainment Area [NH-049-7174a; A-1-FRL-7418-5] received December 2, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

128. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans;

Massachusetts; One-hour Ozone Attainment Demonstration for the Massachusetts portion of the Boston-Lawrence-Worcester, MA-NH Ozone Nonattainment Area [MA069-7205a; A-1-FRL-7418-6] received December 2, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

129. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revision to Operating Permits Program in Washington [FRL-7415-2] received November 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

130. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [CA 262-0371; FRL-7413-1] received December 2, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

131. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants From the Portland Cement Manufacturing Industry [FRL-7416-9] (RIN: 2060-AJ57) received December 2, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

132. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — NESHA: Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Hazardous Waste [FRL-7424-2] (RIN: 2050-AE79) received December 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

133. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans North Carolina: Approval of Revisions to Miscellaneous Regulations Within the North Carolina State Implementation Plan [NC 102-200304(a); FRL-7425-2] received December 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

134. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans for Mississippi: Infectious Waste Incinerator Requirements [MS 23-1-200242(a); FRL-7424-3] received December 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

135. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; Low Emission Vehicle Program [MA087-7215a; A-1-FRL-7418-7] received December 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

136. A letter from the Secretary of the Commission, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Notice and Request for Comment Regarding Textile Corporate Leniency Policy [Billing Code 6750-01P] received December 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

137. A letter from the Secretary of the Commission, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rules and Regulations Under the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act [Billing

Code: 6750-01P] received December 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

138. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Material Control and Accounting Amendments (RIN: 3150-AG69) received December 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

139. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the FY 2001 Inventory of Programs, produced by the Interagency Working Group; to the Committee on International Relations.

140. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the status of the world intellectual property organization copyright treaty and the world intellectual property organization performances and phonograms treaty; to the Committee on International Relations.

141. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Audit of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 5C for Fiscal Years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, Through June 30, 2002," pursuant to D.C. Code section 47—117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

142. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Policy, Management and Budget, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's inventory of commercial activities prepared in accordance with the Federal Activities Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

143. A letter from the Archivist, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's Commercial Activities Inventory and Inherently Governmental Inventory; to the Committee on Government Reform.

144. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a copy of the report, "Stimulating Smarter Regulation: 2002 Report to Congress on the Costs and Benefits of Federal Regulations and Unfunded Mandates on State, Local and Tribal Entities," pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1538; to the Committee on Government Reform.

145. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 Reporting [Notice 2002-26] received December 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

146. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Five Carbonate Plants from the San Bernardino Mountains in Southern California (RIN: 1018-AI27) received December 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

147. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for *Deinandra conjugens* (Otay tarplant) (RIN: 1018-AH00) received December 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

148. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Extend the Interim Groundfish Observer Program Through December 31, 2007, and Amend Regulations for the North Pacific Groundfish Observer Program [Docket No. 020814193-2282-

02; I.D. 070102C] (RIN: 0648-AQ05) received December 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

149. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's proposed legislation entitled, "Title 46 Codification Act of 2002"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

150. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the Annual Report on Civil Works Activities for Fiscal Year 2001; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

151. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Retention of Current Monetary Threshold for Reporting Rail Equipment Accidents/Incidents During Calendar Year 2003 and Until Further Amended [FRA-1998-4898, Notice No. 5] (RIN: 2130-AB57) received December 31, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

152. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — U.S. Locational Requirement for Dispatching of U.S. Rail Operations [FRA Docket No. FRA-2001-8728, Notice No. 3] (RIN: 2130-AB38) received December 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

153. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Withdrawal of Certain Federal Human Health and Aquatic Life Water Quality Criteria Applicable to Vermont, the District of Columbia, Kansas and New Jersey [FRL-7416-3] received December 2, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

154. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Disclaimers, Fraudulent Solicitation, Civil Penalties [Notice 2002-25] received December 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

155. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Coordinated and Independent Expenditures [Notice 2002-17] received December 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WELDON of Florida (for himself, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HALL, Mr. KELLER, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. HART, Mr. DELAY, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. VITTER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. JOHN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas,

Mr. McNULTY, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MICA, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. TERRY, Mr. COLLINS, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. FORBES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WAMP, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. HAYES, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. BURNS, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. CRANE, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. FERGUSON);

H.R. 234. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit human cloning; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HALL, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, and Mr. WELDON of Florida);

H.R. 235. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect the religious free exercise and free speech rights of churches and other houses of worship; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FATTAH (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WATSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. REYES, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. OWENS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FORD, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LEE, and Mr. WATT);

H.R. 236. A bill to provide for adequate and equitable educational opportunities for students in State public school systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. PLATTS);

H.R. 237. A bill to repeal certain amendments to the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BOEHLERT (for himself and Mr. HALL);

H.R. 238. A bill to provide for Federal energy research, development, demonstration,

and commercial application activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LEACH, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. HART, and Mr. PLATTS);

H.R. 239. A bill to facilitate the provision of assistance by the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the cleanup and economic redevelopment of brownfields; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 240. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require Department of Veterans Affairs pharmacies to dispense medications to veterans for prescriptions written by private health-care practitioners in the case of veterans who, after having made an appointment to see a Department of Veterans Affairs physician to obtain such a prescription, have been waiting for longer than 30 days, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. EVANS);

H.R. 241. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to repeal the two-year limitation on the payment of accrued benefits that are due and unpaid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs upon the death of a veteran or other beneficiary under laws administered by the Secretary; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. FARR, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. MEEHAN);

H.R. 242. A bill to make technical corrections in patent law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. INSLEE);

H.R. 243. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, relating to the use of high occupancy vehicle lanes by hybrid vehicles; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. OSE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. LEE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. POMBO, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DREIER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. BONO, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. COX, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. NUNES, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. LANTOS);

H.R. 244. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to permit the exclusive application of California State regulations regarding reformulated gas in certain areas within the State; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLETCHER (for himself, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky);

H.R. 245. A bill to replace the existing Federal price support and quota programs for tobacco with price support and quota programs designed to assist the actual producers of tobacco, to compensate quota holders for the loss of tobacco quota asset value, to provide assistance for active tobacco producers, including those producers who forgo obtaining a tobacco production license, during the transition of the new programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REGULA:

H.R. 246. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 247. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BERRY, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 248. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to strike unrelated provisions concerning changes to the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program and liability for vaccine manufacturers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.R. 249. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an exception to the nine-month duration of marriage requirement for widows and widowers in cases in which the marriage was postponed by legal impediments to the marriage caused by State restrictions on divorce from a prior spouse institutionalized due to mental incompetence or similar incapacity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARR (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 250. A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to promote global acceptance of the principles of international peace and non-violent coexistence among peoples of diverse cultures and systems of government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 251. A bill to protect small businesses from increased tariffs and other retaliatory actions taken by the United States during a trade dispute; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 252. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the period for filing for a credit or refund of individual income taxes to 7 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 253. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to reduce losses to properties for which repetitive flood insurance claim payments have been made; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. OSE, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. ORTIZ):

H.R. 254. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to agree to certain amendments to the Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Mexican States concerning the establishment of a

Border Environment Cooperation Commission and a North American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H.R. 255. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant an easement to facilitate access to the Lewis and Clark Interpretative Center in Nebraska City, Nebraska; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BOUCHER (for himself and Mr. GOODE):

H.R. 256. A bill to provide for premium assistance for COBRA continuation coverage for certain individuals and to permit States to provide temporary Medicaid coverage for certain uninsured employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURNS (for himself, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GOODE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 257. A bill to provide emergency disaster assistance to agricultural producers that incurred 2002 crop losses due to damaging weather or related condition and to provide emergency disaster assistance to livestock producers in counties that received a primary disaster designation by the Secretary of Agriculture in calendar year 2001 or 2002, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CANTOR (for himself, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 258. A bill to ensure continuity for the design of the 5-cent coin, establish the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. FROST, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. RUSH, Mr. OWENS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WYNN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. LEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORD, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. KUCINICH):

H.R. 259. A bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons who have been released from incarceration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. LEE, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. STARK, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. McDERMOTT):

H.R. 260. A bill to extend Brady background checks to gun shows, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. GORDON, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee):

H.R. 261. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow residents of States with no income tax a deduction for State and local sales taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. HART, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DREIER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. OSE, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. POMBO, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FOSSELLA, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. QUINN):

H.R. 262. A bill to allow a custodial parent a bad debt deduction for unpaid child support payments, and to require a parent who is chronically delinquent in child support to include the amount of the unpaid obligation in gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 263. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve access to medical services for veterans seeking treatment at Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinics with exceptionally long waiting periods; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 264. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for payment of lump-sum death payments upon the death of a spouse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DUNN (for herself, Mr. DICKS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. BAIRD):

H.R. 265. A bill to provide for an adjustment of the boundaries of Mount Rainier National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. EHLERS (for himself and Mr. GILCHREST):

H.R. 266. A bill to establish the National Invasive Species Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 267. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an incentive to ensure that all Americans gain timely and equitable access to the Internet over current and future generations of broadband capability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EHLERS:

H.R. 268. A bill to authorize appropriations for the United States Weather Research Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 269. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restructure and replace the income tax system of the United States to meet national priorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 270. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to replace with a more equitable formula the current formula, known as the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation (VERA), for the allocation of funds appropriated to the Department of Veterans Affairs for medical care to different geographic regions of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HINCHY, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 271. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to modify the formula, known as the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation (VERA) system, for the allocation of funds appropriated to the Department of Veterans Affairs for medical care to different geographic regions of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 272. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to Lander County, Nevada, and the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to Eureka County, Nevada, for continued use as cemeteries; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GILCHREST (for himself and Mr. TAUZIN):

H.R. 273. A bill to provide for the eradication and control of nutria in Maryland and Louisiana; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GILCHREST:

H.R. 274. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the property in Cecil County, Maryland, known as Garrett Island for inclusion in the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GILLMOR (for himself and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 275. A bill to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to require improved disclosure of corporate charitable contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOODE (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 276. A bill to repeal section 658 of Public Law 104-208, commonly referred to as the Lautenberg amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODE (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. TANCREDO):

H.R. 277. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to assign members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, under certain circumstances and subject to certain conditions, to assist the Department of Homeland Security in the performance of border protection functions; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 278. A bill to terminate the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 279. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to include drought in the definition of disaster for purposes of the disaster loan program administered by the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. HOBSON (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REGULA, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. NEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. OXLEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. GILLMOR):

H.R. 280. A bill to establish the National Aviation Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HOBSON (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GILLMOR, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. NEY, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. REGULA, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. TURNER of Ohio):

H.R. 281. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 200 West 2nd Street in Dayton, Ohio, as the "Tony Hall Federal Building and United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 282. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit for contributions for the benefit of elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HOLT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HOFFEL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. ETHERIDGE):

H.R. 283. A bill to establish the Nanoscience and Nanotechnology Advisory Board; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts):

H.R. 284. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the required use of certain principal repayments on mortgage subsidy bond financings to redeem bonds, to modify the purchase price limitation under mortgage subsidy bond rules based on median family income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 285. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify certain rules relating to the taxation of United States businesses operating abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. COX, Mr. CRANE, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Ms. DUNN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 286. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of incentive stock options and employee stock purchase plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 287. A bill to prohibit the exportation of natural gas from the United States to Mexico for use in electric energy generation units near the United States border that do not comply with air quality control requirements that provide air quality protection that is at least equivalent to the protection provided by requirements applicable in the United States; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. INSLEE:

H.R. 288. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish programs to enhance roadway safety and improve transportation efficiency in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 289. A bill to expand the boundaries of the Ottawa National Wildlife Refuge Complex and the Detroit River International Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 290. A bill to expand research regarding inflammatory bowel disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 291. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the mandatory minimum penalties provided for possessing, brandishing, or discharging a firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence or drug trafficking crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 292. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to add National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day to the list of days on which the flag should especially be displayed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 293. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking a child hostage in order to evade arrest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 294. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the automobile assistance program for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 295. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require group health plans to provide coverage for reconstructive surgery following mastectomy, consistent with the Women's Health and Cancer Rights Act of 1998; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 296. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for treatment of a minor child's congenital or developmental deformity or disorder due to trauma, infection, tumor, or disease; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. KIRK):

H.R. 297. A bill to require any amounts remaining in a Member's Representational Allowance at the end of a fiscal year to be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction or to reduce the Federal debt; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 298. A bill to posthumously award congressional gold medals to government workers and others who responded to the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon and perished and to people aboard United Airlines Flight 93 who helped resist the hijackers and caused the plane to crash, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the Spirit of America, recognizing the tragic events of September 11, 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 299. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 80 Killian Road in Massapequa, New York, as the "Gerard A. Fiorenza Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. PAUL, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. EVERETT, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. HALL, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. BUYER, Mr. NEY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BURR, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 300. A bill to provide that Executive Order 13166 shall have no force or effect, and to prohibit the use of funds for certain purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

H.R. 301. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the tax on the net capital gain of taxpayers other than corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 302. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives and job training grants for communities affected by the migration of businesses and jobs to Canada or Mexico as a result of the North American Free Trade Agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. NADLER, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. SHAW, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. OSBORNE):

H.R. 303. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both military retired pay by reason of their years of military service and disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McNULTY:

H.R. 304. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor posthumously to Henry Johnson for acts of valor during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McNULTY:

H.R. 305. A bill to establish the Kate Mullany National Historic Site in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. DOOLEY of California):

H.R. 306. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to provide procedures for claims relating to drinking water; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MOORE, Mr. WELLER, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 307. A bill to provide emergency disaster assistance to agricultural producers to respond to severe crop losses and livestock losses incurred in 2001 and 2002, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 308. A bill to provide for the resolution of certain labor issues relating to the merger of the Metro-North Railroad and the Long Island Rail Road; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 309. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of increasing the capacity of water storage, increasing power generation, improving water supply reliability and quality, improving water management efficiency, and improving ecosystem function and flood control on the San Joaquin River through the construction of a reservoir at Temperance Flat and other reasonable measures; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. OSBORNE (for himself, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. WAMP, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FROST, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 310. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion for gain from the sale of farmland which is similar to the exclusion from gain on the sale of a principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PENCE (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GOODE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. AKIN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. OTTER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

H.R. 311. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 10 percent maximum capital gains tax for individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 312. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a dividends paid deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself and Mr. NEY):

H.R. 313. A bill to modify requirements relating to allocation of interest that accrues to the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mrs. MALONEY):

H.R. 314. A bill to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to exempt mortgage servicers from certain requirements of the Act with respect to federally related mortgage loans secured by a first lien, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SEXTON:

H.R. 315. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove the requirement of a mandatory beginning date for distributions from individual retirement plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 316. A bill to eliminate certain restrictions on the availability of credits under title III of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 for the use of biodiesel fuel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 317. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, relating to a rural access project in Mt. Vernon, Illinois; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. MANZULLO):

H.R. 318. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to require consideration under the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program of the extent to which a proposed project or program reduces sulfur or atmospheric carbon emissions, to make renewable fuel projects eligible under that program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 319. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 15 percent reduction in payment rates under the prospective payment system for home health services under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIAHRT:

H.R. 320. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow expanded penalty-free withdrawals from certain retirement plans during periods of unemployment for any employee of an air carrier or of a manufacturer of aircraft or parts or components of aircraft; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

H.R. 321. A bill to establish limits on medical malpractice claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 322. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to assure coverage for legal immigrant children and pregnant women under the Medicaid Program and the State children's health insurance program (SCHIP); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY (for himself, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. WYNN, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 323. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide for joint trusteeship of single-

employer pension plans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. VITTER:

H.R. 324. A bill to restore the consent of Congress to the Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact and to grant the consent of Congress to the Southern Dairy Compact, a Pacific Northwest Dairy Compact, and an Intermountain Dairy Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VITTER:

H.R. 325. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a nonrefundable tax credit against income tax for individuals who purchase a residential safe storage device for the safe storage of firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VITTER:

H.R. 326. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the double taxation of dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 327. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor posthumously to Garlin Murl Conner for acts of valor during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DREIER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RADANOVICH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 328. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend modifications to DSH allotments provided under the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Benefits Improvement and Protection Act of 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico:

H.R. 329. A bill to improve mathematics and science instruction in elementary and secondary schools by authorizing the Secretary of Education to make grants for regional workshops designed to permit educators to share successful strategies for such instruction; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. NORWOOD, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 330. A bill to extend indemnification authority under section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 331. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that military retired pay for nonregular service shall be paid without regard to the age of a person otherwise eligible for such retired pay, rather than commencing when an otherwise eligible person attains age 60; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 332. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study certain sites in the historic district of Beaufort, South Carolina, relating to the Reconstruction Era to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating the study area as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. WU (for himself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WYNN, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD):

H.R. 333. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize grants for institutions of higher education serving Asian

Americans and Pacific Islanders; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SKELTON (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BOYD, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. JOHN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. ORTIZ):

H.J. Res. 12. A joint resolution commending the members of the United States Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. PRYCE of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 8. A concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment or recess of the two Houses; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GOODE (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mrs. MYRICK):

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution urging the President to negotiate a new base rights agreement with the Government of the Republic of Panama in order for United States Armed Forces to be stationed in Panama for the purposes of defending the Panama Canal; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 10. A concurrent resolution condemning the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for its failure to comply with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the U.S.-North Korea Agreed Framework of 1994; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. McNULTY:

H. Con. Res. 11. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the primary author and the official home of "Yankee Doodle"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H. Res. 22. A resolution electing certain ranking minority members to standing committees; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H. Res. 23. A resolution designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the house; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. PRYCE of Ohio:

H. Res. 24. A resolution electing chairmen of certain standing committees of the House.

By Mr. OSBORNE (for himself, Mr. KELLER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FORD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts):

H. Res. 25. A resolution supporting efforts to promote greater awareness of the need for youth mentors and increased involvement with youth through mentoring; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. VITTER:

H. Res. 26. A resolution honoring the contributions of Catholic schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WYNN:

H. Res. 27. A resolution concerning the establishment of a permanent United Nations security force; to the Committee on International Relations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.R. 334. A bill for the relief of Nancy B. Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 335. A bill for the relief of Jaya Gulab Tolani and Hitesh Gulab Tolani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 17: Mr. HILL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 20: Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 24: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 33: Mr. HALL, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, and Mr. MCINNIS.

H.R. 34: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 41: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BACA, Mr. HALL, Mr. Engle, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 47: Mr. FALCOMA.

H.R. 49: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CRANE, Mr. WELLER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 57: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BAKER, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 111: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PLATTS, and Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 127: Mr. HONDA, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FROST, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 156: Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 160: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 167: Mr. DEUTSCH and Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 172: Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 179: Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

H.R. 182: Mr. HOEFFEL, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 218: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. NEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. COMBEST, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.J. Res. 3: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BASS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H. Res. 17: Mr. HILL.

H. Res. 21: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. KUCINICH.